

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

2005

Does California's scripted curriculum affect students' motivation to read

Francene Marie Fisher

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Education Commons](#), and the [Reading and Language Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fisher, Francene Marie, "Does California's scripted curriculum affect students' motivation to read" (2005). *Theses Digitization Project*. 2797.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/2797>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

DOES CALIFORNIA'S SCRIPTED CURRICULUM AFFECT
STUDENTS' MOTIVATION TO READ?

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in
Education:
Reading/Language Arts

by
Francene Marie Fisher
September 2005

DOES CALIFORNIA'S SCRIPTED CURRICULUM AFFECT
STUDENTS' MOTIVATION TO READ?


A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Francene Marie Fisher
September 2005

Approved by:


Diane Brantley, PhD, First Reader


Date


Randall Wright, PhD, Second Reader

ABSTRACT

This thesis looked at the effects of California's adopted scripted learning programs on students' motivation to read. There is much research about the efficacy of these types of one-size-fits all programs, which claim to be on scientific research. In response to the Federal No Child Left Behind Legislation of 2002, many states have chosen to use this type of instruction to meet the strict requirements of accountability and assessment.

Most of California's student population is quite diverse. As of the 2003-2004 school year, there were approximately fifty-seven various ethnic groups and 1,598,535 students classified as English Language Learners (Ed-Data, 2005).

Approximately six hundred third, fourth, and fifth grade students were surveyed, using an instrument developed by (Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, & Mazzoni, 1996). The survey was designed to assess students' motivation to read by asking questions, which target their self-concept as readers and the value they place on reading. The population consisted of students from California schools, which exclusively used scripted programs, and some, that who did not use this type of curriculum.

In addition, the same age students were surveyed in two states, which do not have^{an} adopted curriculum. These states, have^{this}

Ohio and New Mexico allow the individual school districts to choose curriculum based on their local populations.

The results of the survey found no correlation between the use of scripted learning programs and student motivation to read. In fact, the results from both groups were remarkably similar.

Since California adopted the scripted programs in 2003, schools have been using them for less than three years. In addition, the research found that each site uses the programs in varying degrees, depending on the district guidelines, API scores, and whether the schools are meeting Federal AYP goals. The conclusion reached by the researcher is that there is a need to do a follow-up study on this same student population in the next three years. This type of longitudinal study would be more reliable, and would either validate these preliminary findings, or show an effect on motivation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following individuals: Dr. Diane Brantley, PhD, and Dr. Randall Wright, PhD, and Dr. Allayne Sullivan, PhD, for their patience, encouragement, and last minute miracles. Also, thank you, Dr. Margaret Moustafa, PhD, for the advice. Finally, Kimberly Hartnett-Edwards, my academic advisor, teacher and friend who showed me that one person can make a difference.

DEDICATION

To Dad

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
No Child Left Behind	1
Ramifications of the Legislation	4
Effects of the New Curriculum	8
Four Bases for Curriculum Planning	9
Purpose of the Thesis	11
Scope of the Project	11
Definition of Terms	13
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	
Introduction	16
What Affects Students' Motivation to Read	16
What Strategies Do Successful Readers Use?	22
What Strategies Have Been Found to Be Most Effective When Teaching Reading?	24
Why Has California Adopted a Scripted Learning Program?	37
What Are the Components of Scripted Learning Programs?	42

Has the Use of Scripted Programs Had an Effect on Student Learning?.....	46
Conclusion	62
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	
Introduction	65
Instrumentation	66
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND RESULTS	
Introduction	68
Results in Relationship to the Research	70
Limitations of the Study	71
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS	75
APPENDIX A: EXAMPLE OF RECIPROCAL TEACHING	78
APPENDIX B: LITERATURE CIRCLES	80
APPENDIX C: PETITION REQUEST - Instructional Materials Funds Realignment Program (IMFRP)	85
APPENDIX D: PORTION OF PUBLISHER'S LESSON PLAN	96
APPENDIX E: SAMPLE OF STRATEGY SCRIPT	98
APPENDIX F: ROUTINE CARDS FOR SPELLING and PHONICS	101
APPENDIX G: PORTION OF PUBLISHER'S PACING GUIDES	103

APPENDIX H: DISTRICT PACING GUIDE	106
APPENDIX I: DISTRICT EVALUATION OF COMPLIANCE	110
APPENDIX J: SAMPLE LESSON PLAN FOR FIRST/SECOND GRADE COMBINATION, ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS CLASS	115
APPENDIX K: INTERNAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL	119
APPENDIX L: LETTER TO PRINCIPALS	122
APPENDIX M: INFORMED CONSENT- ENGLISH	124
APPENDIX N: INFORMED CONSENT- SPANISH	127
APPENDIX O: SUMMARY OF CONVERSATION WITH ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT	130
APPENDIX P: READING SURVEY	135
APPENDIX Q: TABLE 1	142
APPENDIX R: TABLE 2	144
REFERENCES	147

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

No Child Left Behind

On January 8, 2002, President George W. Bush signed into law legislation called "No Child Left Behind" (NCLB). This new legislation was the latest revision to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, which was designed to guarantee every child in our country equal opportunity and access to succeed in schools.

The ESEA of 1965 was passed as a result of struggle for equality that occurred in the United States during the late 1950s and 1960s. The common belief was that achievement inequalities were a direct result of cultural deficits and class inequality. During this time, the government commissioned the Coleman-Jencks report. The report found that desegregation, among other things did not work. These findings led to several social reforms, which included the ESEA, Head Start, and Title One. The reforms were designed to fix the family, the individual and their culture, rather than the schools (University of Oregon, 1994).

No Child Left Behind is based on four components: 1) stronger accountability for results, 2) more freedom for state and communities, 3) encouraging proven education methods, and 4) more choices for parents. There are several elements of NCLB. One element is called Putting Reading First, (Title I, Section 1003 G), which targets kindergarteners through third graders. Its aim is that every child is able to read by the end of third grade. It provides grants to states, which in turn, make competitive sub-grants to Local Education Agencies, (LEAs), or school districts. The district recipients must administer screening and diagnostic assessments to determine which students in grades K-3 are at risk of reading failure, and provide professional development to K-3 teachers in the essential components of reading instruction.

The accountability portion of Reading First requires states to:

Describe how they will close the achievement gap and ensure that all students, including those who are disadvantaged to achieve academic proficiency. They must produce annual state and school district report cards that inform parents and communities about state and school progress.

Schools that do not make progress must provide supplemental services, such as free tutoring or after-school assistance; take corrective actions; and, if still not making adequate yearly progress after five years, make dramatic changes to the way the school is run (U.S. Department of Education).

The states must meet the requirements or risk losing the Federal Grants, which are sizable. In 2006, the proposed budget allocation for Reading First is \$1,041,600,000. When the legislation went into effect, the allocation was \$975 million (Ed-Data, 2005).

This portion of the legislation was largely based on what was considered scientific research. The U.S. Department of Education states, "scientific research has provided tremendous insight into exactly how children learn to read and the essential components for reading instruction" (Ed.Gov, n.d.). Putting Reading First required states to submit detailed plans on how they intended to comply with the requirements of the legislation by January 31, 2003. In order to do so, each state reviewed their current standards of instruction, and in many cases, made revisions.

arts"(California Dept. of Ed., 2002). The State's adopted instructional programs for all K-3, and K-12 Special Education Students are Houghton Mifflin, California Edition, Reading: A Legacy of Literacy 2003 and SRA/McGraw-Hill, Open Court Reading 2000. There are five other programs that are for grades 4-8. These are also scripted (California Dept. of Ed., 2005).

The rationale for adopting SLPs is that they are scientifically based. The state relied on a presentation by Ed Hirsch, (author of *The Schools We need: Why We Don't Have Them* 1996). The adoption committee also used several studies. Among them are: 1) *Every Child a Reader: The Report of the California Reading Task Force: 1995*, by the California Dept. of Ed., 2) *Teaching Reading: A Balanced, Comprehensive Approach to Teaching Reading in Pre-kindergarten Through Grade Three: The Reading Program Advisory: 1996*, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, California State Board of Ed., CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 3) *Learning to Read: California Reading Initiatives: 1997*, CA State Board of Ed., 5) *A Blueprint for Professional Development: For Teachers of Early Reading Instruction: 1997*, CA State Board of Ed., 6) *The California*

*Reading Initiative and Special Education in California:
Critical Ideas Focusing on Meaningful Reform:*

1999, California Special Education Reading Task Force, California department of Education, and 7) *Read All About It! Readings To Inform The Profession*: 1999, California State Board of Education (California Department of Education, 2002). Some of the same research was the basis for creating the Reading First portion of the NCLB legislation.

Reading anthologies and pre-packaged reading programs do not address individual readers. This is especially true in our schools with English Language Learners or students from low socio-economic backgrounds. Many come from homes that are not filled with books; have had few experiences beyond the confines of their home, and cannot relate to the dominant culture.

Some researchers believe if students cannot make connections to the literature, their comprehension is greatly affected. When you stop to think about how we, as adults try to make sense of complicated texts in a Master's program, we do so, by making connections to something familiar- something we have read about, experienced first hand, or practiced in our own classroom. This strategy of making connections based on prior knowledge, or schema, is

even more vital for emerging readers (Weaver, 2002 and Keene & Zimmerman, 1997).

The ramifications of scripted curriculum are far reaching. Chief among them are the fact that there is no room to customize the program to a child's individual learning needs. According to several teachers who use Open Court, this is a complex dilemma. The programs do provide extra materials for differentiation of instruction. However, in reality, it is "next to impossible" to implement without some type of school wide teaming plan for the directed teaching portion and the rigorous pacing guides (Mrs. M. F, personal communication March 21, 2005).

Teachers are not able to use their professional expertise to reach the children through their own learning styles. Much of these programs are whole group, one size fits all instruction. Hence, teachers are forced, due to state demands of accountability, to teach to the test. In addition to the strict pacing of these programs, teachers have no time to give constructive on-going feedback to the students on an individual basis. The district and/or publisher's pacing guides, accountability demands, emphasis on testing, and extra hours required to train and implement these programs, force teachers to cover a lot of content in a short amount of time, and there is emphasis on assessment (Sunderman, Tracey, Kim, & Orefield, 2004).

Effects of the New Curriculum

The question of whether this type of curriculum has an affect on a student's motivation to read and their attitude toward reading is the focus of this thesis. A student who has a negative attitude toward reading is often a struggling reader. They may find the material too difficult, they may have never experienced success, or, they may never get any positive reinforcement. Any of these experiences will affect a student's attitude toward reading (Johns & Lenski, 2001).

The scripted reading programs are a one size fits all concept. Therefore, if the material is too difficult, there is no relief for the student. If they are having difficulty and know a test is just around the corner, how can they possibly have positive feelings toward the task?

Studies show that motivated students keep trying to succeed regardless of past success (Johns & Lenski, 2001). Motivation can be intrinsic, extrinsic, or achievement based. Students who are motivated feel a sense of control over what they are learning. Clearly, with no choice of text, an emphasis on the test score rather than the experience of reading low-interest level materials, text to which students may have no connection, there will be an eventual impact on motivation.

own. If the stories in the anthologies and other content are not appropriate for the classroom audience, the information may be read and digested, but not truly learned, since it has little relevance. In other words, prior knowledge, schema helps create meaning and useful knowledge. Accordingly, curriculum must have opportunities for teachers to make educational choices that are relevant to the local classroom, since every school site as a diverse population.

This is not to say that standards should be lowered.

As previously stated, the Reading First portion of NCLB challenged states to set standards and make plans to meet them. Most teachers believe that accountability and standards are a positive by-product of the NCLB legislation. However, the standards must be taught in ways that are meaningful and relevant to the students. The research shows that there are several ways to teach a single content standard, and will be discussed in Chapter Two.

itself will be based on the results of The Motivation to Read Survey developed by Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, and Mazzoni, (1996). The survey was given to third, fourth and fifth grade students. The students attend public schools with differing API scores, diverse populations, and which use scripted curriculum in varying degrees. Some schools, especially those who are considered improvement schools, use SLPs exclusively, and strictly adhere to the scripts and pacing guides. Others may use SLPs, but do not use the scripts. Some supplement the SLPs with other programs and strategies, and some use the SLPs as one of many instructional tools.

The survey was also given to students in the same age groups that attend schools outside of California. These states allow the LEAs to choose curriculum based on the needs of their student population, as long as they align with the state standards.

Based on this information, this project will investigate the perceived problem that the scripted curriculum has a negative impact on students' motivation to read. If the hypothesis is correct, that there is a negative effect on motivation, results will show that strict and exclusive use of scripted reading programs does have an effect on student motivation.

Definition of Terms

- Adoption states: These are states that choose specific curriculum to be used by the school districts. The state legislatures allocate funding for instructional materials based on the use of state adopted curriculum.
- API Scores - Academic Performance Index. These are numerical ratings given to schools by the State of California, based on standardized test scores.
- AYP Scores- Adequate Yearly Progress. These numerical ratings given to schools by the Federal Government, based on standardized test scores.
- ELD- English Language Development
- ELL- English Language Learner
- ESEA- "Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965", which was passed by the Johnson Administration.
- LEA- Local Educational Agency (the districts)
- NAEP- National Assessment of Educational Progress. Also known as The Nation's Report Card, These scores are based on assessment of fourth, eighth, and twelfth graders. The national NAEP sample is then composed of all the state samples of public school students, as well as a national sample of nonpublic school students.

teachings of these skills are mostly teacher-directed and highly structured. Teacher's guides are scripted, word for word. They include lesson plans, suggested sequencing, pacing guide, and weekly and daily time requirements for each task.

- SI- Multiple Strategy Instruction
- Supplemental Curriculum- Books, stand-alone tools and programs used in conjunction with existing curriculum to enhance learning.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This literature review examined the research literature in six key areas:

- 1) What affects students' motivation to read?
- 2) What strategies do successful readers use?
- 3) What strategies have been found to be most successful when teaching reading?
- 4) Why did California adopt statewide, scripted curriculum?
- 5) What are the components and teaching methods of the scripted curriculum?
- 6) Has the use of scripted learning programs in California had an effect on student learning?

What Affects Students' Motivation to Read?

The research indicates that motivation to read is crucial for students' success in learning to read. Lack of motivation leads students to pay little attention to ongoing learning (Ediger & Marlow, 1988). "Positive beliefs about reading have an important relation to understanding and engagement toward reading. Positive beliefs translate

into higher levels of motivation and better understanding" (Schraw & Bruning, 1999, p. 281).

Many factors influence motivation. These include classroom environment (Ames, 1992), beliefs about competence, (Wigfield, Guthrie, Tonks, and Perencevich, 2004), choice and interest (Ediger, 1988), and intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. The researchers also found that the act of reading has certain aspects that are unique among the various academic subjects. These are the "social aspects of sharing books with others or the experience of getting totally involved in a captivating book" (Wigfield, et al, 2004, p. 300).

Ediger (1988) believes that learners are encouraged to read more and achieve goals through motivation (p.2). He found that without motivation, a student couldn't obtain and retain new information. The work cites many reasons for lack of motivation, Among which are; a) teacher enthusiasm, or lack thereof b) best-practices teaching methods that require higher levels of cognition and metacognition, c) lack of adequate reading materials that are useful for individual learners, and d) a use of a variety of reading strategies (pp. 3 -5). This is supported by (Wigfield et al., 2004, Schumann et al., 2000).

For others, the classroom atmosphere plays an important role in motivation. Ames' (1992) research

established a link between the classroom learning environment, goal setting and student motivation. She found that motivation is more than simply enhancing a student's self-concept. It has to do with teachers creating a classroom environment where the focus is on effort and commitment. Marshall, (1998) found that to create a learning environment, which was motivational, teachers had to change their beliefs and goals regarding student learning. He contends that the key was for a teacher's focus to be on what the students can accomplish in relationship to their goals. He also found that the teachers' beliefs in the effectiveness of teaching strategies had a strong influence on the classroom environment.

Students' beliefs about their abilities and competence are also factors in attitude and motivation to read. Johns and Lenski (2001), tell us that a student who has a negative attitude toward reading is often a struggling reader. They may find the material too difficult or irrelevant, they may have never experienced success, or, they may never get any positive reinforcement. Any of these experiences will affect a student's attitude toward reading.

Self- efficacy for reading has also been found to have an influence on motivation (Bandura, 1997). This term

refers to a person's beliefs about their ability to complete a task. There are several things that may affect self-efficacy, such as receiving encouragement from others, and their achievement on tasks from the past. However, Bandura found that the most important was previous performance success.

Another influencing factor on motivation to read is what Eccles calls an expectancy value (1983). This theory of motivation holds that a person's expectation of success or failure at a task and the attractiveness or value they place on the task is a strong motivator. There have been many studies, which support Eccles' theory. Among them are Paris and Oka (1986) and Schunk (1985). Both studies found those students who perceive themselves as capable and skilled readers will outperform their peers who do not have the same beliefs. Another study, which supports Eccles' theory, found that if a student perceives reading to be of personal value and relevance, they would read with more effort and vigor (Ames & Archer, 1988).

Schumann, Moody, and Vaughn (2000) researched whether students who became better readers would develop more positive attitudes. The study looked at student academic progress and the impact on self-confidence and self-concept about reading. The results showed that the attitudes of students who made minimal gains declined, whereas students

who made progress toward becoming more proficient readers felt better about themselves and began to develop more confidence in their reading ability.

There is much literature about the effect of choice, control and interest on students' motivation (Nolen & Haladyna, 1990), believe that a child's perception of choice and control over learning has an effect on children's engagement. Pre-programmed instruction does not provide for student choice. For many student groups such as learning disabled, or minorities, the content is fragmented and rarely relates to the experience of the reader (Moustafa & Land, 2001; Schuman, Moody, & Vaughn, 2000). Constance Weaver (2002) agrees. If a child is not engaged, he or she cannot be motivated to read. She believes that preprogrammed curriculum is not an effective way to teach reading. "They include decodable texts, which are usually very low-interest, and which research tells us are more difficult to read than uncontrived text" (p.267).

Providing a variety of books through read-alouds can motivate students to read. Duke (2004) believes this is especially true with informational texts. She found that first graders spend only about 3.6 minutes per day on informational texts. By reading this type of text aloud, and providing hands-on experiences, students will become motivated to read informational texts. An example she used

was to put out a pan of earthworms, allowing students to observe them, and having books about the subject available for students to choose to read.

Another factor in motivation is choice. Johnston (1997), advocates student choice over prescribed text. Teachers can help the students develop a sense of whether or not it is at their ability level. Because of the importance of choice, Johnston developed the Library Model. This model encourages teachers to engage the students in conversations about the books they read.

An example of the Library Model would be for the teacher to select a topic and provide several copies of different books on the topic. Students individually or in literature groups then choose which title interests them. "When children choose what books to read, whether to finish the book, and what interpretation to have of the book, they will read in a different way than if they cannot make these choices" (Johnston 1997, p. 44-45).

Taking ownership and responsibility of what they read can be highly motivating for students. Motivated students want to read, reading creates better readers, and the cycle is self-perpetuating (Johnston).

Good readers use several strategies to help them make meaning from text. The following section will address the various strategies, and the research, which supports them.

What Strategies Do Successful Readers Use?

While there are many effective reading strategies, research shows that all effective readers usually process print in similar ways: They make miscues, or mistakes, but these do not affect meaning and are frequently self-corrected. They continually predict and make inferences as they read. When they come across something they do not understand they use multiple strategies. Sometimes, they read on to try and decipher the word or meaning, other times they guess and check to see if it makes sense, as a last resort, they will try and sound the word out or ask. Effective readers are confident. They also know that reading has a purpose and they try to understand what they read and can retell it. Retellings by an effective reader are well organized, they contain the main points, and they can accurately describe a character (Cambourne, 1988, p. 172-179).

There are numerous studies on effective strategies for teaching reading comprehension. While no one method works for all students, teaching various reading strategies to children at an early age can help develop and reinforce comprehension. (Duke, 2004). "Strategies that appear to improve comprehension include monitoring students' understanding and making adjustments as needed; activating and applying prior knowledge by making predictions;

students to interact, take new information, and build upon what they already know (Carter, 2004).

In 1992, Carter implemented Reciprocal Teaching into a school in Michigan that was failing and in danger of state takeover and or sanctions. After thorough training of the staff and school wide implementation, the school saw student achievement in less than a year. Carter chose this strategy because it was research-based, easily understood by students and teachers, and allowed students to interact with the text in order to construct meaning (Carter, 1997). She documents Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Reading scores for fourth graders in 1991, prior to implementation, to 1992, post implementation. They went from 8.6 to 9.8. By 1994, the scores had risen to 28.8. There was also similar significant achievement in the MAEP scores for seventh and tenth graders (Carter 1997, p. 67).

Reciprocal teaching, (RT) is based on a constructivist approach to learning. This approach tells us that learning is a process that takes place when the student actively looks for meaning and tries to apply it to their personal experience (Allen, 2003).

Four reading comprehension skills are developed and used in reciprocal teaching: questioning, summarizing, clarifying and predicting. Once text is read, either as a whole group, individually, or in pairs or small groups, the

process begins. By summarizing the key points, students learn to find the most important details. Students also make notes of words, ideas or parts of the text that do not make sense. When the discussion begins, the teacher and students assist each other in the process. If, for example there is a word that needs clarification, the teacher may model decoding strategies by re-reading the sentence to look at the context. They may read on to see if it becomes clear, they may look at the word itself to see if there are recognizable parts, or they may move on.

Questioning is an important part of the process. There are two main types pf questions- above and below the surface questions. Students are encouraged to use both types to stimulate discussion. An above the surface question is one in which there is a specific answer, which can usually be found in the text. As the students answer these types of questions, they are encouraged to find the page where the information was found. Then they reread the passage to the group to confirm or clarify their response.

Below the surface questions require higher order thinking skills. These questions usually begin with "What if... why..., and do you think...". In order for these questions to be answered, students practice inference, prediction, and application of prior knowledge. All of the strategies allow the learner to become an active participant in their

learning. As with many reading strategies, they are adapted to fit the classroom environment. Appendix A is just one example of RT (See Appendix A).

Literature circles are similar in many ways to reciprocal teaching. These groups are usually fluid, and can be used in different ways. One example is that each group reads a different book based on a particular theme. Another variation is that each member of the group reads a different book, then compares and contrasts the texts. Literature groups use methods similar to RT, and may also include the task of making connections. That means the reader finds a connection from the text they read to something from their own experience or another text they have read.

This strategy is also based on constructivist learning. Because each participant in the group bring unique experiences, the differing interpretations and opinions enhance learning by allowing students to view text from varying perspectives. (See Appendix B for an example of one type of literature circles).

However literature groups are structured, the one thing they have in common is that they encourage dialogue, debate and the sharing of idea and opinions. "They not only reinforce readers' evaluation, an aspect of affect, but also reinforce the notion that reading often results in a

highly individual rather than a universal affective response" (Mizokawa & Hansen-Krening, 2000, p.76).

Campbell, Johnson, and Noe (1995) are strong advocates for the efficacy of literature circles. They believe that as students become actively engaged in conversations about what they read they develop higher order thinking skills, take responsibility for their learning, and build self-confidence (p.110).

Authentic Learning Experiences

Giving students an opportunity to learn through authentic learning experiences also builds literacy skills and comprehension. This is especially useful when students are reading informational texts. For example, rather than merely having students read about the life cycle of a frog, set up a tadpole tank. Any hands on, real life example will build up students' experience, schema and development of comprehension (Duke 2004).

Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI) is a method that gives students the opportunity to engage in authentic learning experiences by integrating reading with other subjects. This approach is based on the belief that "students' reading outcomes are based on the joint functioning of cognitive comprehension strategies, motivational processes, conceptual knowledge, and social interaction among learners" (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000).

An example of CORI is linking reading to science. Students participate in several hands-on science activities. The teachers provide several books on subjects related to the science activities and experiments, students are given the opportunity to choose specific areas to study, and they work in groups. Reading instruction emphasizes the six reading strategies recommended by the NRP: activating background knowledge, student questioning, searching for information, summarizing, organizing graphically, and learning story structure (National Reading Panel, 2000).

A study conducted by Wigfield et. al (2004), compared two methods of reading instruction, CORI, and Multiple Strategy Instruction, (SI). The latter method, SI, does not integrate subjects. Reading instruction involved the use of the six strategies recommended in the aforementioned NRP report. The study involved 450 third graders and lasted twelve weeks. Results of pre- and post study analyses of children's responses to questions about *motivation* to read showed higher motivation by the CORI group. Also, in a similar study, a CORI group out performed students who received SI type of instruction using basal readers in reading comprehension (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000).

Authentic learning is important for comprehension and also has an impact on students throughout their school

experience. In a study of 49 urban high school students, those who experienced authentic instruction were more engaged with their learning. Another study conducted one on one interviews with 29 students from a large suburban upper-Midwest high school. The results showed that adolescents wanted and valued curriculum that was personally relevant, and wanted more opportunities to apply their learning to real-life situations (Certo, Cauley, & Chafin, 2003). Guided Reading is another strategy for developing comprehension.

Guided Reading

This practice has four components: 1) book selection, 2) grouping, 3) instruction, and 4) monitoring and adjusting. Roser, 2000, p. 33). Guided reading addresses individual needs and does not involve whole-class instruction. This method involves flexible, temporary grouping. Students' needs determine the groupings. For example, the teacher may focus one group's instruction on understanding the use of quotation marks to indicate who in the story is speaking (Weaver, 2002).

As with any strategy, there are variations. Calkins (2001) begins with a book introduction to get students excited and interested in the text. Next, she front loads new vocabulary, and points out any potentially challenging passages. The students then read the text either silently

or aloud to themselves. The teaching point is given through a mini-lesson toward the end of the session. The students discuss the text, and the teacher refers back to the part of the text, which illustrates the teaching point.

Other variations on Guided Reading start with the book talk, front load vocabulary, and conduct a short mini-lesson. After students read the text, the teaching point is reviewed, using the text to illustrate the lesson.

Despite variations, Guided Reading involves grouping based on immediate needs. Plans for the next session are based on the progress or challenges that came about from the small group session (Calkins, 2001, p. 176-177).

In order to provide students with time to practice the skills and strategies gained through Guided Reading, they should participate in daily silent reading.

Sustained, Silent Reading

Sustained Silent Reading, (SSR), or free reading gives students the opportunity to select text that interests them. This can include fiction, non-fiction, comic books, or newspapers. Teachers give students free reign to sit back and enjoy reading.

There have been several studies about the efficacy of SSR in the classroom. Most of the studies show positive effects on students' reading comprehension and vocabulary. Until the NCLB legislation that advocated a research-based

reading program that aligned with State and Federal standards, SSR was a recommended part of many states' reading/language arts standards and curriculum (Allington, 2002, p. 226). With the passage of NCLB, the priority of reading instruction and methods has changed. Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Susan B. Neuman, defined the Reading First Initiative as "teaching rather than facilitating- leading from up front, not from the back. It is not sustained silent reading, or rather sustained silent faking. They need instruction" Neuman (2002).

Most studies show that marked improvement is made over duration of seven months or longer (Davis, 1988; Elley, 1991). However, there are other studies that find improvement in students who practice SSR for less than seven months (Burley, 1980; Langford & Allen, 1983). Other studies find no difference between students who regularly practice SSR and those who do not (Oliver, 1973; Evans and Towner, 1948). One of the most famous studies that found no difference was the 1991 report by the National Reading Panel. This study found, "no difference between SSR and skills practice" (NICHD, 1991). This report has been widely criticized. As Stephen Krashen points out, "What the panel did not mention is that the entire treatment lasted only ten days, not one month as the

or newspapers. Teachers give students free reign to sit back and enjoy reading.

There have been several studies about the efficacy of SSR in the classroom. Most of the studies show positive effects on students' reading comprehension and vocabulary. Until the NCLB legislation that advocated a research-based reading program that aligned with State and Federal standards, SSR was a recommended part of many states' reading/language arts standards and curriculum (Allington, 2002, p. 226). With the passage of NCLB, the priority of reading instruction and methods has changed. Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Susan B. Neuman, defined the Reading First Initiative as "teaching rather than facilitating- leading from up front, not from the back. It is not sustained silent reading, or rather sustained silent faking. They need instruction" Neuman (2002).

Most studies show that marked improvement is made over duration of seven months or longer (Davis, 1988; Elley, 1991). However, there are other studies that find improvement in students who practice SSR for less than seven months (Burley, 1980; Langford & Allen, 1983). Other studies find no difference between students who regularly practice SSR and those who do not (Oliver, 1973; Evans and Towner, 1948). One of the most famous studies that found no

Towner, 1948). One of the most famous studies that found no difference was the 1991 report by the National Reading Panel. This study found, "no difference between SSR and skills practice" (NICHD, 1991). This report has been widely criticized. As Stephen Krashen points out, "What the panel did not mention is that the entire treatment lasted only ten days, not one month as the NRP reports" (2001, p. 121). Further examination of the methods used in the research show that each four groups of researchers focused on specific skills: locating details, drawing conclusions, identifying the main idea and sequencing. The students studied over this ten-day period based on these criteria showed no difference on tests of comprehension skills. The panel concluded, "engaging in sustained reading in connected and meaningful text appeared to be just as effective as spending the time on the learning and practicing of discrete comprehension skills" (NICHD, 1991).

(Krashen 2001), while questioning the validity of the findings, concludes his critique of the study by saying,

Even finding no difference between free readers and students in traditional reading programs suggest that free reading is just as good as

traditional instruction, which confirms that free reading does indeed result in literacy growth, an important theoretical and practical point. Because free reading is so much more pleasant than regular instruction, for both students and teachers, and because it provides students with valuable information and insights, a finding of no difference provides strong evidence in favor of free reading in classrooms (2001, p. 121).

This statement supports the findings on student motivation and choice in separate studies by Johnston (1997), Smith (1997), and Weaver (2002).

In their Report *Becoming a Nation of Readers*, the National Academy of Science recommended SSR. "Research suggests that the amount of independent silent reading children do in school is significantly related to gains in reading achievement" (Anderson, Heibert, Scott, and Wilkinson 1985, p. 76). A summary of this report by *Parents Raising Educational Standards in Schools*, on to say that independent reading should be made a priority. "Two hours a week of independent reading should be expected by the time children are in the third or fourth grade. To do this,

children need ready access to books and guidance in choosing appropriate and interesting books (P.R.E.S.S., 2002).

All students, even those in kindergarten can interact with books by reading the pictures. Weaver (2002) believes that daily interaction with print is important for all readers, whether emergent or independent (p.233). In his book, *The Power of Reading*, Krashen (1993) goes on to say that SSR is important for and, but vital for children from low-income families. These students typically have little access reading material in the home and do not frequent the library. Many are from homes, which do not provide print rich experiences.

Read- Aloud

Calkins' (2001) beliefs about Reading Aloud are so strong she says students should never be part of a classroom where the teacher does not read aloud each day. By reading aloud, teachers can expose children to a variety of literature. The U.S. Department of Education, along with the National Academy of Science evaluated thousands of studies on the importance of reading aloud. In their report, *Becoming a Nation of Readers*, the authors

concluded, "The single most important activity for building the knowledge required for eventual success in reading is reading aloud to children" (Anderson et al., 1985, p. 23). The study went on to say that this was important at home and in the classroom throughout all the grades.

Although some students are read to at home from an early age, many from low-income or non-English speaking homes may not have the same opportunity. Beck and McKeown (2001) believe it is incumbent on teachers to take advantage of the many benefits of classroom read-alouds. Texts that are read aloud are effective tools for developing comprehension, vocabulary development, word recognition, and prediction. It also gives children an opportunity to interact with de-contextualized language. This occurs when children are encouraged, through book talks, think alouds, and discussion to try making sense of ideas that are new or different from their schema.

The authors believe the teacher is key in developing and modeling these skills. Do so within the context of a read-aloud is a non-threatening and enjoyable experience (Beck & McKeown, 2001).

Why Has California Adopted a Scripted Learning Program?

There are two main programs that are State approved in California- Open Court Reading (2002), published by SRA, a division of McGraw Hill, and HM Reading, California (2003) published by Houghton- Mifflin, Incorporated (California Department of Education, 2004). Both programs have similar components. While LEAs are free to choose any curriculum, they are not eligible to compete for Reading First Grants unless they choose the State's adopted instructional programs, Open Court and Houghton Mifflin. While LEAs have the right to choose other curriculum, they must go through an extensive waiver process, including a public hearing (See Appendix C), (CDE, 2004). For purposes of this review, Open Court Reading will be discussed in detail.

Scripted curriculum takes what it considers to be the basic skills needed for learning to read and write, and breaks them down into separate parts (Peck & Serrano, 2002). The teacher's guides are highly structured, some scripted, word for word. They include lesson plans, scripted or suggested sequencing, a pacing guide, and weekly and daily time requirements for each task. There are explicit skills lessons, specified, required literature, literature response questions, workbooks and assessments (Boyd, 2002). School districts determine the extent to which the program must be implemented. There may be coaches

who oversee teachers to ensure that the directions are explicitly followed (Peck & Serrano, 2002). Some LEAs provide the teachers with their own pacing guides.

The rationale for this type of instruction is that students learn best in a systematic, explicit setting where there is direct instruction in sound and word recognition, guided practice and application of skills with reading in decodable texts and literature. Open Court guarantees "The most effective practices in education, academic research, field testing, and learner verification results (SRA, 2002). Further, it claims to have "organized the lessons in the most logical and efficient way possible for teaching children to read and write with skill and confidence. All you need to do is follow the directions"(p. V).

This is very difficult for teachers who teaching multi-age classrooms. A public school teacher who has since left the profession taught a second-third-grade combination class with ELLs and ELDs. Despite her attempts to follow the publisher's directions, they do not address multi-grade classrooms. In the 2003/2004 school year, there were 6,578 combination classes in grades K - 4 (Ed-Data, 2005). Lesson planning in itself was a challenge (See Appendix D).

The perception of reading acquisition is that it can be learned as a science and is acquired based on chronological age. This is evidenced by the presentations at the Reading

First Leadership Academy. In her introduction, Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Susan B. Neuman said, "We want every child, and I mean every child, reading by the end of third grade" (Neuman, 2002). It was also said that, "Every student should read, read well, and read on time" (Hunter, 2002). These statements seem to imply that all children learn to read in the same way at the same time.

At the same meeting, Kameenui presented a workshop on effective methods of teaching reading. "In later grades, once children have foundation reading skills, the focus of assessment shifts to fluency and reading comprehension. The number of words read per minute is a pretty good indicator of comprehension down the road" (2002).

In a report to the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Education Reform, a leader of the Child Development and Behavior Branch of the National Institutes of Health reported, "The president's proposals are predicated on a science of reading development and reading instruction" (Lyon & Kameenui, 2001). According to proponents of this belief, learning to read is best accomplished through "precisely worded and deliberately scripted programs" (Foorman, Francis, Fletcher, Schatschneider, & Meta 1998).

This type of curriculum, which is often focused on facts, memorization, and testing preparation, offer what are touted as formulae for success, but treat every student alike (Rice, 2004). California, and some other states, have adopted this type of curriculum in response to the demands of the No Child Left Behind legislation, passed in 2002.

This legislation is based on four major components, one of which is stronger accountability for results (United States Department of Education, 2004). In order to comply with the strict guidelines, states are obligated to reach improvement goals or Adequate Yearly Progress, (AYP). Schools that fail to meet these goals face serious consequences. If a school fails to make AYP for two consecutive years, they are identified as an improvement school. The site has three months to develop an improvement plan. Additionally, they must inform parents of the choice option- an opportunity to attend a different school. If this choice is made, the school must provide transportation for the student. If schools do not meet their AYP for a second year, they must continue to provide families with school choice and provide supplemental services for students, which include after school tutoring and intervention.

After the third year of not making AYP, corrective action must take place. A comprehensive plan is for

improvement is made. In addition to the choice and supplemental services, the plan must include at least one of the following: replacements of staff, relinquishment of management authority, use of an outside "expert" advisor, and restructuring the organization of the school. The following year, year four, if AYP is not achieved, the district must choose one of the following: become a public charter school, replace all or most of the staff, including the principal, contract with a private company to manage the school, allow the State to take over management of the site (U.S. Dept. of Ed., 2003).

Because of these severe consequences, several states became adoption states. The list includes: California, Florida, and Texas. (Manzo 2003). Adoption states have opted to select officially adopted state curriculum. In most adoption states, districts receive state funds to purchase textbooks only if they are on the list of state adopted programs. Some like California, do provide an opportunity for LEAs to seek a waiver and purchase other materials (See Appendix C). The application process is extensive and most LEAs do not pursue waivers.

States that do not have officially adopted programs are considered open states. These states allow the LEAs to choose curriculum in subject areas based on the needs of

their populations as long as they align with state standards (Vogt and Shearer, 2003, p. 181).

Most state adopted programs are SLPs and are said to improve student achievement. These scripted learning programs contain several components, which will be discussed in the following section.

What are the Components of Scripted Learning Programs?

Both SLPs adopted by California, Open Court and Houghton Mifflin have similar components. They use themes to integrate all areas of language arts- reading, writing, speaking, and listening. They have tools designed to teach sounds and letters, phonemic awareness, phonics and fluency at the lower levels. They also teach comprehension strategies and skills such as clarifying, summarizing, predicting and inference. There are components that teach spelling, vocabulary, writing, English language conventions and grammar usage (Houghton Mifflin, 2003; SRA, 2002).

The publisher defines the components of Open Court as: explicit instruction, systematic instruction, routine cards, systematic lesson plans, explicit phonics instruction, student anthologies, assessment, intervention, and English-Language development (SRA, 2002). The publisher introduces the Teacher's Edition with the following statement, "Each lesson begins with whole-group, teacher-

directed lessons, so that all children have access to the same models and information" (SRA/McGraw-Hill, 2002, p. xvi). (See Appendix D)

Explicit instruction involves "specific, teacher-directed presentation of the lesson content, including teacher modeling, followed by student practice and assessment" (p.8). The next component is systematic instruction. This involves teaching skills in a specific order and progression. This employs the use of routine cards, which give step-by-step directions on how to present a lesson. This is a script, which the teacher reads to ensure that, "nothing is left out" (p.8). (See Appendix E for an example.)

Each lesson contains a prepared lesson plan that covers three areas over the course of five days: 1) preparing to read, 2) reading and responding and inquiry, and 3) Language Arts. Day one begins with an entry assessment and day five ends with a comprehension test. The publisher contends that this pre-planned method reduces teacher prep time and eliminates guesswork SRA (2002, p. 10).

Phonics instruction is designed to use proven methods and provide equal access to instruction. Depending on the grade level, the tools include pre-decodable books or decodable books. There are take-home books, sound spelling cards, audiocassettes, sound spelling desk strips and

lesson cards. The lesson cards, like the routine cards provide the format and script for instruction (See Appendix F for an example of routine cards).

The student anthologies, depending on the grade level, include novels, poems, plays, realistic fiction, informational text, short stories, and essays. The various genres are presented in themes. For example, the third grade anthology has a theme of Friendship. The anthology includes fiction, realistic fiction, a poem, a biography, and a myth. There are also leveled books for the classroom library, which coincide with the theme.

This scripted program contains extensive materials for assessment. There are three assessment areas: 1) Program Assessment- a pretest, midyear test, and posttest. 2) Unit assessments for oral fluency, writing, spelling, vocabulary, listening, grammar usage and mechanics, and comprehension, 3) Diagnostic Assessment for placement in re-teach, intervention challenge and ELD. Record keeping tools and rubrics for writing, portfolio, comprehension and inquiry are also included. There are also materials for standardized test preparation.

The components for instructional differentiation include specific instruction on ways to enhance the whole class instruction with intervention for controlled vocabulary and specific skills lessons. There are also ELD

lessons, re-teaching workbooks and challenge activities (SRA, 2002). Time is provided each day to enable the teacher to conduct this instruction. Students who do not fall into these categories use the time to read to each other, read independently, and work on unfinished projects.

The program also shows the teacher how to set up a Concept/Question Board. This is a bulletin board where students can post questions during inquiry time, share ideas that coincide with the theme, or add articles or pictures that go with the theme.

Many agree that the programs' components, especially in the early stages do contain effective ways to teach reading (American Federation of Teachers, 1998). One study found that children who received directed focused instruction in letter-sound correspondence through the use of decodable text improved their reading at faster rate than those who did not (Foorman et al., 1998).

Despite these findings, some argue that the pacing, the script, and the lack of attention to individual needs make the programs ineffective. "Evidence points to the need to allow teachers the flexibility to select the methods, approach and materials to fit the child and the situation" (National Reading Panel, 1999).

Open Court begins the third grade year with a unit on friendship. The pacing guide suggests one week to get

assessment for each concept taught. There is a two-day unit wrap up, and then a formal unit assessment. This includes eleven pages of short answer and multiple-choice questions. In addition, there is a writing portfolio assessment, a listening assessment, a teacher's record of oral fluency, and a formal assessment record (SRA 2002, p. IIIP).

The publisher's pacing guide allows teachers twenty eight to thirty-seven days to complete the introduction, lessons, review and assessment (SRA, 2002). Some school districts have developed their own pacing guides, along with specific implementation and an evaluation of compliance (See Appendices H and I). The guide is designed to ensure Open Court implementation as proscribed by the teaching guides. Reading coaches inspect classrooms for evidence by looking for postings of daily schedules, specific displays, bulletin boards, workbook use, standards implementation, and writing implementation (PSUSD, 2004).

Has the Use of Scripted Programs Had an Effect on Student Learning?

There has been very little research in this area. The results are mixed and can be confusing. Since the use of scripted learning programs in many states is relatively new, (California, for example officially adopted SLPs in

school staff become educated consumers of educational programs and practices (p.1).

In its study of Open Court, the report states that students' achievement data was limited at the time of the study to the Kindergarten through second grade curriculum. In one of the case studies of a K-5 school in Brooklyn, New York, a school wide implementation of the program along with other literacy related materials yielded higher test scores. The conclusion was that "this could be a highly effective program when implemented well" (AFT, p.25).

Other research shows that this type of instruction was more helpful for primary students because they learned to decode faster (Peck & Serrano, 2002). The publisher lists many studies by experts in Reading Acquisition in support of its methods (SRA Online), and there are just as many studies that point out that the research and published results are flawed (Manzo, 2004; Moustafa & Land, 2001). Dr. Moustafa states that in order for a program to be research based, there must be a control group. Many question the publisher's claims about being a research-based program, since

there is no control group. When the control group (the teacher) is removed because they are following a script, how can a cause and effect relationship be proven (Moustafa & Land, 2001)?

Wilson, Martens, and Arya (2005) found that test scores of students who learn to read with Open Court were showing improvement. Their study focused on the impact of SLPs on comprehension, strategy use, and understanding of the reading process. The scores of second graders using the program did correlate with the publisher's claims. However what was measured, according to the researchers, did not measure the students' understanding of the reading process or use of reading strategies. The results showed that students' scores on naming characters and identifying setting were strong, and closely aligned to the publisher's claims, 74% and 84%, respectively (p. 627.) The students also demonstrated ability to use graphophonic skills.

However, the study goes on to show that the same students' ability to make connections, inferences, predict and retell were weak. When the students were

asked what strategies they used when they came to words they did not know, most said they tried to sound the words out or asked for help (Wilson et al., 2005, p. 628). The researchers concluded that while standardized tests scores were improving with SLPs, the tests do not measure effective reading strategies, levels of comprehension, and ability to make meaning, skills all of which they claim the SLP does not adequately teach. Effective readers are not merely able to decode. These readers possess the ability to choose from a variety of strategies, to derive meaning from the text (Calkins 2001; Cambourne (1988)).

Some studies on the efficacy of these programs found *both* advantages and disadvantages in the curriculum. There were some districts where students showed increased achievement, behavior and engagement positively affected by scripted learning programs. These include higher test scores, and smoother transitions from kindergarten to first grade (Posnick-Goodwin, 2002). Other research found that "student achievement, behavior, and engagement are often advantageously affected" (Boyd, 2002). Having a core

curriculum, which was adopted across the grade levels, with sequenced instruction in phonemic awareness and the structure of language, was a positive result (Boyd, 2002).

Some teachers reported that students who transferred school to school do not have to learn a new program or be placed at a different level. Others felt that the structure was advantageous for new teachers. Teachers reported that scores have jumped and attribute the results to Open Court.

On the other hand, these same reports found that some disadvantages of using a scripted program. Among them were lack of teacher input, material that was irrelevant to the students, and a test driven focus. "Focusing on test-driven instruction may produce short-term results, rather than long-term success, because scripted programs focus more on word recognition and rote memorization rather than critical thinking skills and comprehension (Posnick-Goodwin, 2002, p. 12).

Although Boyd's study listed some strengths, she also found some weaknesses. One was the fact that teachers are

not the flexibility to tailor instruction to the students' individual needs (2002). The National Reading Panel states that "Evidence points to the need to allow teachers flexibility to select the methods, approaches, and materials to fit the child and the situation. Reading instruction involves too many variables to simplify and prescribe it for all children in all situations" (1999). California Teacher's Association President, Wayne Johnson (2002) agrees. He believes that while there are some positive aspects to the scripted programs, teachers have been left out of the loop in terms of how to use the tools included in the program. "Teachers are among the best-educated people in society, and half of them have advanced degrees" (p.9). Allowing teachers to use their classroom experience and knowing the specific needs of their students is the key for success.

Scripted programs have specified readability levels. In his discussion of grade-level appropriate reading, Johnston (1997), tells us that on the surface these guides seem very logical. However,

there are large differences between individuals,
so that for any individual the ordering might be

quite different. This is particularly true for Kindergarten and First graders. It is one thing to talk about the average level of difficulty for a large number of students & quite another to apply that ordering to a particular student. It requires qualifying the ranking with 'all else being equal', which is simply never the case" (p. 42).

Another weakness Boyd (2002), found is that programmed instruction does not take into account the way children actually learn. (p. 52). Parkay and Haas (2000) discuss human development as an important base for effective curriculum planning. "Each learner is innately unique, and this inborn individuality indicates the importance of providing many alternatives in educational programs" (p. 100). These types of programs do not consider the unique qualities and experience that each reader brings with them.

Additionally, there is much research about the ill effects of scripted programs, particularly with respect to English Language Learners and economically disadvantaged students (Peck & Serrano, 2002). Since this type of curriculum uses materials that presupposes schema that many of the student population

does not possess, it is not effective. Many found that because of the whole class instructional approach and rapid pace, many English Language Learners, (ELLs), were left behind.

Other studies found no evidence that scripted reading programs correlate with higher reading scores (Moustafa & Land, 2001). Dr. Moustafa co-authored a study on reading achievement of economically disadvantaged children. The study focused on children in urban school schools. Some schools used Open Court and others did not. She concluded that, "We found no evidence that Open Court fosters higher early reader achievement among economically disadvantaged children". The study goes on to conclude that the reported SAT-9 achievement scores, (one of many standardized tests), between the two groups in second grade were virtually the same.

While there are few longitudinal studies of the efficacy of SLPs in post NCLB legislation, many schools have used earlier editions of Open Court. The Moustafa-Land study looked at scores of second through fifth graders in schools that had used the SLP for ten

or more years. These scores were compared with their peers in non-SLP schools. The study found that more students from SLP programs were in the bottom quartile of SAT-9 results. "We further found no justification in sacrificing instruction in other curricular area to implement Open Court" (Moustafa & Land, 2001).

Conversely, some research that supports scripted curriculum in larger school districts, where there are frequent student transfer rates. Since the curricular needs vary from district to district, larger districts that lacked a pedagogical focus have experienced benefits (Boyd, 2002). One report by the American Federation of Teachers, (AFT) found that students' achievement scores did improve in some case studies and concluded that this was an effective program (1998, p.25).

Scripted curriculum is a one size fits all method of instruction. During reading instruction, every student was given the same material to read, at the same pace and at the same time, with no differentiation based on the students' background, schema, or ability. Not only is this method contrary to the research on effective teaching, it can lead to behavior problems, since the higher students,

not challenged by the material complete the work and could become disruptive (Schuman, Moody, & Vaughn, 2002).

Scripted programs are also criticized because of the focus on assessment. Many believe that teachers are more focused on covering the material that is tested and less time on untested areas. In other words, they are "teaching to the test". Research on this type of teaching by Wiggins tells us that:

Teaching to the test can lead to worse, not better student performance on standardized tests- in much the same way that student musicians would worsen over time if all they were taught to worry about were isolated fingering exercises and paper and pencil questions about their instruments and music (1998, p. 45).

Wiggins' assertions are supported by a recent study by educators in the Harvard Civil Rights Project (Sunderman et al., 2004). The study found that about 70% of teachers questioned, stated they spent more time teaching items that will be tested at the expense of subject that are not on the state mandated tests.

Planning effective curriculum must address the four bases of curriculum. They are: a) Social Forces, b) Human Development, c) Learning and Learning Styles, and d) The Nature of Knowledge. Each of these must be taken into account when planning curriculum (Parkay & Haas, 2000).

Social forces have a large influence on planning. These include the national level, (legislation, government demands, and political forces), local community, (students' background, family structure and class structure), and school culture, (teachers' role in the schools, values, beliefs and assumptions) (Parkay & Haas, p. 53). SLPs do not take the local community and school culture into account. There is no cultural pluralism in the program. "Cultural pluralism requires that curriculum planners and teachers develop learning experiences and environments in which each groups' contribution to the richness of the entire society is genuinely validated and reflected to the extent possible in the curriculum" (p. 55).

There is also criticism of the curriculum because it does not reflect individual or developmental differences in students (Parkay et al.). The authors believe that teachers should have the opportunity to see what works and does not

work within their own student population. Our educational system is not like those of other countries like Japan, where a national curriculum is effective. We are a diverse society (2000).

Another area where the literature finds deficiencies in SLPs is in its lack of regard to learning styles. Students are not passive learners. According to constructivist learning theories, learners actively try to make sense of new information based on what is known. Strategies should focus on students' thinking, background, and learning styles (Parkay & Haas, 2000). SLPs contain material that assumes background knowledge that for many students, especially ELLs, does not exist (Peck & Serrano, 2002).

Learning style theorists such believe that curriculum needs to contain materials that address various learning styles and differences. Although they use different terminology and have differing opinions about learning styles, they all agree that as individuals, we all acquire knowledge in a different way, and effective curriculum must provide for these differences (Parkay & Haas, 2000).

(Snider, 1992) believes that those who develop, plan and choose curriculum should be aware of the concept of

learning styles and realize that some materials may be more effective for some students, but not for others.

The last base of effective curriculum, according to Parkay and Haas (2000), is the Nature of Knowledge. They state that curriculum should take into account that all learners acquire knowledge that is personally useful, and as they learn, they develop their own individual structure for that knowledge (p. 221). SLPs that contain prepackaged lesson, strategies, and step-by-step guides for delivery may include some effective strategies. However, the methodology, designed to develop higher order thinking skills actually inhibits thinking for both teachers and students (Barbour, 1998).

Another result of scripted curriculum is that teachers are no longer able to use their professional expertise to deliver instruction, tailored to the students' individual needs. California Teacher's Association President, Wayne Johnson (2002) believes that while there are some positive aspects to the scripted programs, teachers have been left out of the loop in terms of how to use the tools included in the program.

Teachers themselves have varied opinions of the efficacy of scripted programs. Some feel that they are especially helpful for new teachers or those on emergency credentials since there is little planning involved. Others believe they are effective programs because they are phonics based, have good literature, they teach themes and comprehension. One veteran teacher of fourteen years endorsed Open Court because it provided everything she needed in one package, rather than having to pull material from several sources (Posnick-Goodwin, 2002).

In other cases, teachers felt devalued as professionals, and left out of the decision making process when it came to deciding what individual students need. While the teachers found some positive components, they felt that the program, overall, did not allow them to deviate from the prescribed pace and script. "This isn't teaching, this is just reading out of a book. Anybody can do this. It doesn't take someone who's had five years of college" (Posnick-Goodwin, 2002, p. 10).

Because of the diversity of the California student population, many teachers are teaching grade combination classes that contain ELLs and English speakers. Scripted

programs require a great deal of planning and effort. One teacher of twenty years, who has since left the profession provided the researcher with a portion of her lesson plans for her first-second-grade combination class (See Appendix J). She stated, "It was next to impossible to address the needs of the students or even begin to complete the plans. Classroom management became a nightmare, and I felt that I was allowing too many students to fall through the cracks. It was a matter of survival" (Mrs. M. F, personal communication March 21, 2005).

On the other hand, there are many in the field of education that believe that scripted learning programs are very effective. Dr. Louisa Moats, Director of Professional Development and Research Initiatives, at Sopris West Educational Services, did a presentation at the Secretary of Education's Reading Leadership Academy in 2002. She specializes in the implementation of school wide interventions for improving literacy. She directed the NICHD Early Reading Interventions Project and worked on the California Reading Initiative. In her presentation, Dr Moats said, "Teachers don't want endless choices. They want structure. They want fewer choices. They don't want to invent their own curriculum. They want to know what works" (2002). Dr. Moats' comments underscore the controversy about SLPs.

Conclusion

The research shows that scripted curriculum can be effective if implemented in a sensible manner (AFT, 1998, Boyd V. 2002, Posnick-Goodwin, 2002). If teachers are given the ability to adapt the program when necessary, in order to fit the individual needs of the students, SLPs could be valuable curriculum. Since students are so diverse, the methods of instruction are most effective when there is flexibility to meet the needs of individual populations.

Student motivation has been found to be an important factor in the acquisition of reading. Research shows that students become motivated through choice Johnston (1997), classroom environment, (Ames, 1992), value of oneself (Wiggins, 1998), and intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Scripted curriculum does not provide for choice or interest, since it is a "one size fits all program" (Schumann et al., 2000).

Teaching strategies that involve students have proven to be the most effective in students' acquisition of reading and language. Because the classrooms contain students from diverse backgrounds, the tools we use to ~~teach must take background, schema, and experience into~~ account in order to be effective (Carter, C., 1997, Keene, et al, 1997, Moustafa, et al, 2001, Peck & Serrano, 2002).

Scripted curriculum can be one of many tools available to teachers to reach all students and help them learn.

State adopted curriculum in California is here to stay. There are high stakes assessments because of NCLB, and with the re-election of George W. Bush, this legislation will remain law, at least for the next four years. The Federal Legislation's goal is that every child can read by the time they leave the third grade. NCLB has implemented the Reading First initiative, which gives the states Federal Grants to encourage attainment of this goal. They cannot mandate a specific curriculum, and it gives State the choice of how to try and meet the goal. (U.S. Dept. of Education, 2005)

The review of the literature shows that SLPs are not necessarily scientifically based reading instruction (Manzo, 2003; Foorman et al, 1997; Meyer, 2002). The one-size fits all, directed instruction approach may have short-term benefits, but there have not been longitudinal studies. There is no evidence that these programs benefit ELLs or special needs students. In light of the contradictory claims, if the SLPs are indeed having a negative effect on students' motivation to read, California must take a different approach to curriculum by addressing the needs of students at the local level.

This would involve giving teachers the ability to incorporate parts of the SLPs, and other effective instructional methods to meet the needs of their specific classroom population, rather than using a curriculum that assumes a homogeneous group of learners in classrooms across the state.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Students were given a survey, developed by Gambrell, Palmer, Coddling, and Mazzone, (1996), which is designed to measure students' motivation to read (See Appendix N). Four hundred fifty-two students from in seven California public schools, in grades three, four and five, responded to the survey. The students used Open Court and Houghton - Mifflin in the classroom. The 2003-2004 API scores ranged from 575 to 888, and four out of seven met Federal AYP goals.

Approximately 150 third, fourth, and fifth grade students in private California schools were also included. One of the schools used an SLP as supplemental curriculum, and the other did not use an SLP. (These schools do not have API scores or AYP accountability.)

In addition, sixty-four students in Ohio and New Mexico completed the survey. These states do not have API scores. Neither school met AYP goals for the 2003-2004 school year. These states do not have specifically adopted curriculum. The curriculum decisions are left to the LEAs.

In order to ensure validity, the questions on the survey were read aloud to the students. The students were assured of their anonymity, and were asked only to indicate

their grade and gender. In addition, the researcher emphasized the fact that she was interested in the students' honest answers, not those they felt a teacher might want to hear.

Once the instrument was chosen, permission was to conduct the survey was granted by the Internal Review Board, (See Appendix L). Letters were sent to principals, requesting permission to conduct the surveys (See Appendix H). The participating schools were provided with Informed Consent forms in both English and Spanish (See Appendices I and J). The surveys were conducted in all schools, with the exception of schools D, F, J, and K.

Instrumentation

The *Motivation to Read Profile* (Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, & Mazzone, 1996) assesses two aspects of reading motivation, the reader's self-concept, and the degree to which they value reading (See Appendix N). In the survey, the odd-numbered questions look at self-concept, and the even numbered questions look at value of reading.

The questions use a four-point Likert response scale. In order to avoid a response set or pattern response, where children select the same answers for each item, the response alternatives randomly alternate from most to least positive, to least to most positive. Questions one, four,

five, seven, eight, ten, eleven, fifteen, eighteen and twenty are scored from least to most positive, while the other are scored most to least positive. The instrument also includes two questions at the end of the survey, which require yes or no answers.

The researcher included two questions at the end of the survey, which require yes or no answers. Question twenty-one asked if the student liked to read. Question twenty-two asked if given a choice of television or reading, which activity would they choose. The answers to these questions were tallied, and an average response was obtained.

The developers of the survey have thoroughly documented the process they used to ensure validity and reliability. They described the methods used in designing the questions and the extensive field-testing conducted in the creation of the survey (Gambrell et al., 1996).

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

Introduction

The survey found virtually no difference in the results between the two groups of students. Table 2 shows a comparison of the results of each question (See Appendix P). With few exceptions, the average scores of each question for both groups were within a range of .4%. In these cases, the group of students who learned using SLPs was higher (more positive), than those who did not use SLPs. Although the differences in scores are not statistically significant, each question in which these results occurred was examined.

Question number two was, "Reading is something I like to do never, not very often, sometimes, often". The Scripted Group averaged a 3.28 score, which correlates to the answer sometimes. The non-scripted group response averaged 2.3, a .98% difference. This answer correlates to the not very often response.

The next discrepancy was found in question eight. This question asked about the students' impression of other readers. "People who read a lot are, very interesting, interesting, not very interesting, boring. The scripted group's response was an average of 3.16, which correlates

to interesting. The non-scripted group's average response was 2.68, a .41% difference, which lies between the not very interesting and interesting categories.

The next response with a difference of more than .4% was question eleven. "I worry about what other kids think about my reading every day, almost every day, once in a while, never." The scripted group's average response was 2.06, which correlates to once in a while. The other group average was 1.65, which falls in between the never and once in a while categories. Here, there was a difference of .41%

The last question with a difference of .54% was question 14. "I think reading is: a boring way to spend time, an OK way to spend time, an interesting way to spend time, a great way to spend time." The scripted group average was 3.38, an interesting way to spend time, while the non-scripted group averaged 2.84. Again, this score falls between two responses: an OK way to spend time and an interesting way to spend time.

Responses to questions twenty-one and twenty-two, added by the researcher, also yielded similar results. Eighty-four percent of the respondents in the scripted group indicated that they liked to read. Similarly, 88% of the non-scripted group liked to read.

The last question, which read, "At home, if I had nothing to do, I would read or watch T.V.". In both groups,

only 44% of the students said they would choose to read. Most students had difficulty answering this question. Many stated that it depended on what program was on and whether the book was interesting. Each group had a percentage of responses that could not be included in the average because students chose both answers or did not choose an answer. This will be discussed in the limitation section of the chapter. There was a significant difference in the answer to question twenty-two from the out of state students. Fifty-eight percent would choose to read over television. This sample is certainly not large enough to generalize results over an entire group, but may warrant further investigation.

In the survey, questions two, eight, and fourteen look at the students' value of reading. Question eleven pertains to the students' self-concept as a reader. While these differences are minimal, these results seem to coincide with the research on the efficacy of Scripted Learning Programs, which will be discussed in the following section.

Results in Relationship to the Research

~~The research on the efficacy of Scripted Programs~~
is inconclusive. Some studies show that these programs can be effective (AFT, 2003, 1998; Boyd V. 2002; Posnick-Goodwin, 2002). The researcher found studies

that both supported and refuted the publishers' claims that SLPs were scientifically proven to increase student learning.

Many in the field of education are opposed to the programs because they do not accommodate the needs of the diverse population of the classrooms.

Additionally, some have found that there are insufficient longitudinal studies to either prove or disprove the effectiveness of this method of teaching. California officially adopted the curriculum in 2003 (Wilson, et. al 2005). Improvement on test scores may occur, but their study, which focused on the impact of SLPs on comprehension, strategy use, and understanding of the reading process, found no positive impact.

The students surveyed are in third, fourth and fifth grade, and have been in SLPs for less than three years. This study can find no correlation between SLPs and motivation to read.

Limitations of the Study

1) The researcher is a fifth grade teacher in a private school. A survey, developed by Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, and Mazzone (1996), which address attitudes toward reading and motivation to read, was given to different student populations. Without personal relationships with public

school administrators in the local school districts, it was difficult to administer the survey to the number of public schools originally intended.

2) It was found that school districts vary in the degree to which they adhere to the pacing guides. They also vary in terms of how rigidly the administration requires use of the curriculum and the scripted aspects therein. These are uncontrolled variables and the researcher relied on the teacher and principal's information about the degree to which the pacing guides are enforced.

3) The population samples of students in private schools are not as ethnically or socio-economically diverse as those in public schools. Therefore, the assumption was made that many of the students came to these school with a richer schema and there were fewer ELLs.

4) Since the researcher did not conduct the survey in Ohio New Mexico and three California schools, it is assumed that the survey was read aloud to the students, as per instruction, to ensure validity.

5) In a few instances where the survey was conducted by the researcher, some students completed the survey before the questions were read. Others were observed looking at other students' answers before marking their own. This occurred, despite the fact that the researcher was repeatedly explicit in her desire to get students' own responses, and

thoughts, rather than those, which they believed a teacher might want to hear or what their friends may feel.

6) Since most of the participating schools were in California, it was difficult to find a large pool of participants that were in reading instructional programs that were not scripted.

7) The question is controversial. In fact, while seeking approval to survey students in one local district, the researcher was denied access by the Assistant Superintendent of Instruction (See Appendix K for a synopsis of the conversation). Unbeknownst to the researcher, the Assistant Superintendent had been instrumental in choosing Open Court for the district and felt that this was going to be an attack on the curriculum, rather than a survey on student motivation. In the 2003-2004 school year, sixty-two percent of the schools failed to meet state API goals (Ed-Data, 2005).

8) While the research instrument is designed to give an indication of students' motivation to read, proficiency and success is in itself, an intrinsic motivator. The research instrument does not address the actual proficiency of the reader. Rather, it surveys the *student's perception of themselves as readers*. Students' actual ability may be a factor.

9) The questions on the survey were read aloud to the students. If the student was an ELL, it was requested that an interpreter read the question both in English and in Spanish. This did occur in two of the schools where the researcher administered the survey. It cannot be assumed that this occurred in the other sites. Additionally, these students may have felt compelled to answer the questions based on what they perceived the interpreter desired.

10) The instrument also includes two questions at the end of the survey, which require yes or no answers. These questions asked whether the student liked to read, and, whether they would choose to read if given a choice. There were several students who had a difficult time answering question twenty-two. They commented that their choice depended on what programs they would miss or whether the book was interesting.

11) The researcher was not able to interview any of the respondents. By randomly selecting students who were identified by their teachers as high, average and low readers, as suggested by the Gambrel et al. (1996), the researcher would have had an opportunity to elicit some comments that may have provided some more insight into the child's perceptions about themselves as readers, and their attitudes toward reading.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

NCLB is here to stay. There are high stakes assessments, and it appears that this legislation will remain law, at least for the next four years.

California is one of has chosen to use state adopted curriculum. This is not mandated by the NCLB legislation. Many states, such as Nebraska, Ohio, and New Mexico have developed plans to meet the requirements of the Reading First Initiative. While the researcher was not able to large samples of students in these states, their responses to the last question of the survey were higher than those in California schools. Although they comprised just a small percentage of the non-scripted group, 58% would choose to read over watching television. Perhaps this study should be broadened to a larger group of students outside the state.

Since California adopted the programs in 2003, schools have been using the programs for less than three years. In addition, the research found that each site uses the programs in varying degrees, depending on the district guidelines, API scores, and whether the schools are meeting

addition, the research found that each site uses the programs in varying degrees, depending on the district guidelines, API scores, and whether the schools are meeting Federal AYP goals. The conclusion reached by the researcher is that there is a need to do a follow-up study on this same student population in the next three years. The follow-up study should also include a larger sample of student populations in open states. This type of longitudinal study would be a more valid study, and would either validate these preliminary findings, or show an effect on motivation.

By allowing schools and educators to use tools that best fit the needs of their populations, along with proven, effective comprehension strategies, and expertise, teachers will be able to address the needs of all students. Being able to help students use their background and schema to make connections and enhance comprehension will help them to become successful readers. Meeting the individual student's needs gives every child the opportunity to learn to read. This was the intent of the President Johnson's ESEA, and NCLB.

Motivation to read is vital for reading success. Since reading is an activity that improves with practice and effort, the goal is to get students to choose to read. By helping students achieve success, students will become motivated to read. Ideally, this desire will exist beyond the required reading within the classroom walls, and develop into a lifelong pursuit. Because every child differs, there is no magic bullet, which will reach all learners. Teachers who are able to use a variety of methods to help child succeed, based on those students' individual needs, cannot help but accomplish the intent of No Child Left Behind:

Reading is the foundation for all other learning, the administration has set the goal of making sure every child knows how to read at grade level by the third grade. Reading opens doors to children who otherwise would struggle through school, lacking the skills to succeed and grow. Literacy is a vital skill for a successful student. Children who learn to read well early in life are more likely to be engaged and experience academic success, a deficiency in reading skills impacts achievement in all other areas of education" (US Department of Education, 2005).

Reciprocal Teaching Process

(with scaffolds for more student support)

Read	One student reads the section out loud.
Question	Questioner asks questions: <i>My On-the-Surface question is...</i> <i>My Under-the-Surface question is...</i> Other students answer questions.
Clarify	Clarifier asks for or gives clarification: <i>I need to have _____ clarified.</i> <i>Do you need anything clarified?</i>
Summarize	Summarizer summarizes: <i>Here's my summary of the most important information...</i> Other students add to summary.
Predict	Predictor predicts with evidence: <i>My prediction is...</i> <i>My evidence is...</i> Other students agree or disagree and give evidence.

APPENDIX B
LITERATURE CIRCLES

FRONT of cards

SUMMARIZER

In your own words, tell the group what the text said. Explain the reading in two or three sentences. Think like the author and try to figure out what he or she wanted to tell you. The others in the group will help you if you get stuck or if they think you forgot something.

BACK of cards

SUMMARIZER

"Here's my summary of the most important information..."

Ask group members for additional input.

CLARIFIER

You will first ask the group to help you clarify any words or ideas that you did not understand.

You will then ask anyone in the group if they need any words or ideas clarified. Work with the group to determine meanings of unknown vocabulary or unclear ideas.

Make sure the group feels comfortable asking for clarification.

CLARIFIER

"I need to have _____ clarified."

"Do any of you need anything clarified?"

Remember to make group members feel comfortable about asking for clarification.

PREDICTOR

You will tell the group what you think you will read about next. What is the writer going to say now?

Tell the group what evidence in the reading leads you to believe this. The others in the group will agree or disagree with your prediction and give their own evidence.

PREDICTOR

"My prediction is..."

"My evidence is ..."

Ask group members if they agree or disagree and to give their evidence.

BACK of cards

QUESTIONER

"My On-the-Surface question is..."

"My Under-the-Surface question is..."

Ask anyone else if they have questions.

FRONT of cards

QUESTIONER

You will ask two questions about the reading.
One is an On-the-Surface question—the answer is found in the text. The group will be able to answer this question correctly.

The other is an Under-the-Surface question—the answer is not obvious. The group might not be able to answer this question. If not, they need to decide where the answer could be—in the clues, in another source, or in the reader's mind.

APPENDIX C
PETITION REQUEST- INSTRUCTIONAL
MATERIALS FUNDS REALIGNMENT PROGRAM
(IMFRP)

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

PETITION REQUEST – Instructional Materials Funds Realignment Program (IMFRP)

PR-1 (Rev. 10/28/04) <http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/ir/wr/>

Page 1 of 2

Send Original plus one copy to:

Waiver Office, California Department of Education

Faxed originals will

not be accepted!

1430 N Street, Suite 5602

Sacramento, CA 95814

CDS CODE									
Local educational agency:					Phone contact and recipient			Contact	
Address:				(City)		(State)		Phone (and extension, if	
(ZIP)									
Period of request:				Local board approval date:			Date of		
LEGAL CRITERIA									
<p>1. Under the authority of the petition process, <i>Education Code</i> (EC) sections 60421(d) and 60200(g), this local educational agency (LEA) requests the State Board of Education (SBE) to authorize the use of any "instructional materials allowances" for the purchase of other instructional materials as listed. Give a brief description of publisher name, grade level, edition, and price list of the materials to be purchased, and total amount of "instructional materials allowances" to be spent in this manner (if this is insufficient space, add to attached narrative):</p>									

2. Public hearing requirement. A public hearing is not simply a board meeting, but a properly noticed public hearing held during a board meeting at which time the public may testify on the petition request. Distribution of local board agenda does not constitute notice of a public hearing. Acceptable ways to advertise include: (1) print a notice that includes the time, date, location, and subject of the hearing in a newspaper of general circulation; or (2) in small school districts, post a formal notice at each school and three public places in the district.

3. Certification by local board for petition to purchase other instructional materials with "Instructional Materials Allowances." In checking each of the boxes below, the local governing board acknowledges its certification or understanding of the following:

☐ Authorizes the submission of the petition to the SBE under EC 60421(d): *"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, pursuant to subdivision (g) of Section 60200, the State Board of Education may authorize a school district to use any state basic instructional materials allowance to purchase standards-aligned materials as specified within this part."* (AB 1781, Statutes of 2002)

☐ Verifies that the local governing board has determined that the state-adopted materials do not promote the maximum efficiency of pupil learning in the district or school(s) as specified under EC 60200(g).

☐ Verifies that the requested materials have been evaluated for consistency with the content standards that have been adopted by the SBE, and that the materials are aligned and reasonably adhere to the standards in this subject.

**Certification by local board for petition to purchase other instructional materials with
"Instructional Materials Allowances" (continued)**

☐ If the instructional materials requested for purchase through this petition (or the instructional material proposed by the district to supplement a non adopted program) have not been previously reviewed by the CDE, for the purposes of adoption or the review of another LEA's petition request, the LEA must include with the petition request:

- A complete set of standards maps indicating alignment with the grade-by-grade standards for the material. Forms are available through the Waiver Office; many publishers should have these standards maps available.
- A complete set of the actual instructional materials must also be mailed to the CDE for review against those standards maps. Call the Waiver Office at (916) 319-0824 for mailing instructions.

☐ Verifies that the proposed materials have passed state or local level legal compliance review, or are exempt from such as review. Check approved list at CDE's Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Materials web page on the Instructional Materials Funding Realignment Program information.

After considering the issues listed above, this local governing board has determined that the purchase of the proposed resources will promote the maximum efficiency of pupil learning in our agency, and has approved the submission of this petition to the SBE.

Signed: _____, School Board President of (LEA)

Instructional Materials Funds Realignment Program (IMFRP)

Petition Process - Instructions

Assembly Bill 1781, statutes of 2002, established the IMFRP (EC 60420 et seq.) and amended EC 60240, which continues, and changes the Instructional Materials Fund. This fund source replaces both the old Instructional Materials Fund (EC 60240 et seq.) and the Schiff-Bustamante Fund (EC 60450 et seq.). Both of these fund sources were eliminated on June 30, 2002, although LEAs may spend carryover for an additional two years under the old rules for each.

There are now two references in the *Education Code* regarding the petition process for the new IMFRP as follows:

EC 60421 (d): "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, pursuant to subdivision (g) of Section 60200, the State Board of Education may authorize a school district to use any state basic instructional materials allowance to purchase standards-aligned materials as specified within this part." (AB 1781, Statutes of 2002)

EC 60200(g): "If a district board establishes to the satisfaction of the state board that the state-adopted instructional materials do not promote the maximum efficiency of pupil learning in the district, the state board shall authorize that district governing board to use its instructional materials allowances to purchase materials as specified by the state board, in accordance with standards and procedures established by the state board." (EC 60200 (g), the old IMF petition language now referenced in AB 1781, Statutes of 2002)

The following actions should be taken at the local level and documented in a written narrative by the district before requesting the petition:

1. Through the process established by the local board for instructional materials adoption process and based on the needs of the schools and students in the district show the implementation of a well designed, Standards-Aligned Curriculum Plan that best promotes the maximum efficiency of pupil learning in the district:
 - That the goals and objectives in the subject area and information on how the goals were developed;
 - Information describing the student population that will be using the proposed resources: e.g., relevant test scores, ethnic distribution, socio-economic data, participation in specialized or categorical programs, a comparison of the proposed resources with state adopted programs identifying differences and describing why the state adopted resources do not promote the maximum efficiency of pupil learning in the district;
 - A description of the process by which these proposed resources was evaluated for standards alignment. (See item 2, below for more suggestions on this section);
 - The relevant projected timeline for the purchase of the proposed resources, the fund source (current year or carryover), and the total amount requested to be spent on the requested materials, and;

- The plans for staff development for teachers regarding the use of the resources, how teachers will use the resources.
2. Through this comprehensive evaluation process, choose instructional materials that will promote the maximum efficiency of pupil learning in the district. This process will include as applicable:
- Verify that where the SBE has adopted content standards, that the materials are aligned sufficiently with and reasonably adhere to these standards. Standards maps for each grade level for the proposed instructional materials should be thoroughly reviewed by the committee for this purpose;
 - Where the review of the standards maps for the proposed instructional materials against the state adopted content standards show gaps, develop a plan to remedy these weaknesses in the implementation of the material at each grade;
 - For the purchase of specialized materials to help bridge the gaps between the adopted texts and the abilities of pupils, due to their handicapping condition or other specialized needs, consider the individual educational needs of these pupils. In these cases, although adopted materials may be available, the students require other materials to bridge the gaps in learning ability.
3. Establish that the materials comply with EC 60040 through 60048 et seq., and the SBE's "Standards for Evaluating Instructional Materials for Social

Content,” as determined by a Legal and Social Compliance Review conducted by the CDE (list available at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/documents/socialcontent.pdf> by publisher or title materials. If there has been no statewide review, the LEA may conduct a local level legal compliance review. In addition, some materials are exempt from legal compliance and may also be requested and purchased after a petition approval.

Your petition request is now ready to go to your local board for approval.

1. The local board must hold a properly noticed public hearing on the submission of the petition to the SBE, and the proposed purchase and use of the other standards aligned instructional materials. The SBE must also approve the “Certification by Local Board for Petition to Purchase these Instructional Materials form” with “Instructional Materials Allowances” to be signed by the local board president (this certification is now part of the Petition Request form itself).
2. Include the required other attachments to the Petition Request:
 - A brief description of publisher name, grade levels, and price list of instructional materials to be purchased, and total amount of “instructional materials allowances” to be spent in this manner (if not already included in item 1 on the first page of the Petition Request);

- A narrative describing the reasons for the petition, based on student needs; evidence of a well designed, Standards-Aligned Curriculum Plan, the local review process of standards maps of this particular material, including a description of how weaknesses in these materials will be supplemented (if necessary), and verification of legal and social compliance;
- Provide a copy of the latest district or county office of education local board resolution regarding compliance with EC 60119. The governing board shall hold a public hearing or hearings at which the governing board shall encourage participation by parents, teachers, members of the community interested in the affairs of the school district, and bargaining unit leaders. The LEA shall make a determination, through a resolution, as to whether each pupil in each school in the district has, or will have before the end of that fiscal year, sufficient textbooks or instructional materials, or both, in each subject. Check recent adoption lists at:
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/index.asp>;
- Provide evidence of exemplary academic achievement or growth, by district, or school(s), and where appropriate, by subject matter, grade level, and significant subgroup. These forms are available at:
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/gr912stmap.asp>.

3. If the instructional materials requested for purchase through this petition (or the instructional material proposed by the LEA to supplement a non adopted program have not been previously reviewed by the CDE, for the

purposes of adoption or the review of another LEA's petition request, the LEA must include with the petition request:

- A complete set of standards maps indicating alignment with the grade level standards for the subject matter. The forms are available at: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/gr912stmap.asp>, but many publishers should have these standards maps available;
- A complete set of the actual instructional materials must be mailed to the CDE for review against those standards maps. Call the Waiver Office at (916) 319-0824 for mailing instructions.

Petitions, if approved by the SBE, will be:

- For a limited period of time (as specified in the period of request), and will not become permanent;
- For a specified amount of expenditure of "instructional materials allowances" dollar amount and percentage;
- For a specified program or resource, at specific grade levels and copyright years.

In all cases, petitions should be prospective so that funds are not spent before the approval of the petition by the SBE.

Revised 11/10/04

APPENDIX D
PORTION OF PUBLISHER'S LESSON PLAN

English Language Conventions

Introduction to the Writing Process

Introduce Writing Process Steps

Inspiration

Brainstorming

Make a list of ideas on the board. Have students write ideas that appeal to them in their Writer's Notebooks.

Getting Ideas

Have students think of three places, objects, or people they know well enough to describe in detail.

Good writers are not born good writers. They learn to be good writers. How? They do it by studying and practicing the traits of good writing. The traits of good writing are certain qualities. Our reader reading is enjoyable. These traits are described below and on the following pages.

Idem

Your ideas should be clear, original, and supported by details. Ideas are the heart of your writing. Good ideas are supported by colorful details that make writing satisfying. In a thesis, less writing should have a main idea that makes a clear message to the reader. Use accurate details to support your idea.

Read the paragraph from *Angel Child, Dragon Child*.

My sister slipped through the same gate two by two: Mother was first there to slip with me, Mother was in away to Vietnam. She could not say "Ta my hai" or, be an Angel Child & happy in your new American school."

When you read the paragraph, do you think, "I want to know more about (4). I like reading about people from other countries?" The author gives enough details to make the reader curious about (4)'s culture and even about what he/she is like.

13. The Impact of Technology

Language Arts Handbook p. 10

Grammar: Nouns Eng. Lang. Conv. 1.8

- Use *Language Arts Handbook*, page 246, for the definitions and examples of common and proper nouns.

- Explain that nouns name a person, place, thing, or idea.
- Explain that common nouns name people, places, things, or ideas, but that proper nouns name *specific* people, places, things, or ideas. For example, *dog* is a common noun, while *Spot* is a proper noun.
- Write two columns on the board. Title one *Common Nouns* and the other *Proper Nouns*. Fill in one column and have students fill in the other. Common nouns you could use are *teacher*, *house*, and *state*. Corresponding proper nouns could be *Mrs. Jones*, *White House*, and *California*.

Use the *Comprehension and Language Arts Skills*, pages 2–3, to identify nouns and name what kind they are.

[illegible]

**Comprehension and
Language Arts Skills p. 2**

APPENDIX E
SAMPLE OF STRATEGY SCRIPT

Note: The script is under "teacher modeling".

2

Reading & Responding

Angel Child, Dragon C

COMPREHENSION

Comprehension Strategies

First Read

Teacher Modeling

4 Asking Questions *I'm confused about something. Why does Ut think you can catch snow? Why does she seem to know so little about snow?*

I think I can figure this out by rereading. It's probably winter. I know that Ut and her sister are from Vietnam. I also know that Vietnam has a tropical climate, because I have read other stories about the country. I think that Ut and her sister have never seen snow before. This is probably their first winter in America, and snow is new to them. Remember to keep asking questions and figuring out the answers as you read.

Word Knowledge

plural of:
feathers
windows
trees
leaves
fingers
snowflakes
kisses
cheeks
disappears

Teacher Tip: WAIT TIME

It is important to allow time for students to respond. Although silence can be uncomfortable, don't automatically jump in with more questions or your own response—wait.

Teacher Tip: Good readers constantly evaluate their understanding of what they read. Stop often to make sure students are doing this.

One day it's the frosty winter is snow. It makes trees with red. My fingers waited for the the door. Outside, my cheeks. It disappeared.

Comprehension Strategies

First Read

Teacher Modeling

6 Visualizing *I can just imagine what Raymond's face looked like when Ut said his name and offered him a piece of her cookie. I can see the surprise and happiness in his face. He is glad that she is being kind to him. I think he will return the kindness. I can see that both Ut and Raymond look happier and feel better now. Continue to form mental images of the characters and events in the story as we read.*

Word Knowledge

-ed endings: bounced
 answered



Teacher Tip Encourage students to think aloud, practicing the strategies they have learned. Tell students that their ideas about the story are very important to the whole class's understanding of the story.



APPENDIX F
ROUTINE CARDS FOR SPELLING AND PHONICS

Routine Card Level 1 • Units 7-10

1. Introducing Sounds and Spellings

- Point to the back of the *Sound/Spelling Card* and ask the students what they already know.
- Turn the card.
- Point to the picture and name it.
- Point to the spelling(s) and name the spelling(s).
- Read the alliterative story.
- Repeat the sound and give the name of the spelling.
- Point to the spelling and have the students give the sound.
- Write the spelling; at the same time have the students write the spelling in the air and say the sound as they write it.
- Have students listen for target sounds.
- Have students practice writing and proofreading the spelling on board.
- Review—name of card, sound, spelling(s).

2. Sound-by-Sound Blending

- Write the spelling for the first sound.
- Have students say the sound.
- Write the spelling for the second sound.
- Have students say the sound.
- If the second sound is a vowel, blend through the vowel making a blending motion with your hand.
- Write the spelling of the next sound.
- Have students say sound.
- If it is the last sound in the word, make the blending motion as students blend and read the word; if it is not the last sound, continue writing the spellings.
- Students reread the word naturally as they would speak it.
- Complete a line and have the students read the words in the line.
- Have students use selected words in sentences and extend the sentences.
- Review blended words using activities in Developing Oral Language.

3. Blending Sentences

- Underline nondecodable, high-frequency sight words in the sentence first.
- Then blend the sentence:
 - Write the sentence as you blend it.
 - Students may use the sound-by-sound technique for each decodable word in the sentence. (Have students use Whole-Word Blending when they are ready.)
 - Say and underline each nondecodable word in the sentence.
- Have students read the sentence and then reread it naturally.

Routine Card 1

4. Whole-Word Blending

- Write the whole word.
- Point to each spelling and have the students blend the sound.
- Have students blend the sound for each spelling.
- Have students blend the sounds and say the word.

5. Reading Decodable Books

- Teach nondecodable, high-frequency sight words.
- Have the students read the title, browse, and then discuss what story is about.
- Read the Decodable book. Students:
 - read a page silently, then read the page aloud.
 - blend decodable words and refer to the *Sound/Spelling Cards* as necessary.
 - repeat this procedure for the each page.
- Respond to the story. Students:
 - discuss hard words.
 - retell the story.
 - respond to questions by pointing to the answers.
- Reread Decodable book (partner reading, choral, turn-taking, and the like) to build fluency.

6. Dictation: Sounds-in-Sequence

- Say the word, use the word in a sentence, and repeat the word.
- Have students say the word.
- Have students say the first sound.
- Have students check the *Sound/Spelling Cards* and say the spelling. (Early in the process, physically point to and touch the appropriate card.)
- Have students write the spelling.
- Complete the spelling of the remainder of the words in the same manner.
- Students proofread. (Circle any incorrect words and rewrite them.)

7. Dictation: Whole-Word Dictation

- Say the word, use the word in a sentence, and then repeat the word.
- Have students say the word.
- Have students think about each sound they hear. (Students should be encouraged to check the *Sound/Spelling Cards*.)
- After each line, write (or have a student write) the words on the board.
- Students proofread. (Circle any incorrect words and rewrite them.)

Routine Cards
From Grade 1 Teacher Edition

APPENDIX A
EXAMPLE OF RECIPROCAL TEACHING

APPENDIX G
PORTION OF PUBLISHER'S PACING GUIDES

UNIT

Lesson 1

Gloria Who Might Be My Best Friend

Suggested Pacing: 3-5 days

DAY 1

LESSON PLANNER

1 Preparing to Read

Materials

- Student Anthology, Book 1, pp. 24-27
- Decodable Book
- Assessment CD-ROM
- Sound/Spelling Cards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14
- Decodable Book 11
- Lesson Model
- Vocabulary
- Routine Cards 1, 2, 3
- Routines 1-2, 3-4

2 Reading & Responding

Materials

- Student Anthology, Book 1, pp. 24-27
- Program Assessment
- Reading Transparencies 1, 48, 49, 50, 51
- Happy Journal, p. 2
- Routine Cards 1-2, Routines 3-4
- Home Connection, p. 21
- Unit 1 Assessment, pp. 2-3
- Writer's Notebook

Inquiry

Materials

- Student Anthology, Book 1, pp. 24-27
- Happy Journal, pp. 5-6
- Reading Transparency 2
- Research Assistant CD-ROM

3 Language Arts

Materials

- Comprehension and Language Arts Skills, pp. 2-3
- Language Arts Handbook, pp. 16, 248
- Language Arts Transparency 38
- Sound/Spelling Card 1
- Spelling and Vocabulary Skills, pp. 2-3
- Student Anthology
- Writer's Workbook, p. 2

Entry Assessment

Grade 3 Pretest

Unit Overview

- Previewing the Unit, pp. 12-13
- Read About, pp. 136-137
- Word Knowledge, pp. 140-141
- Spelling, pp. 142-143
- Inflectional endings, pp. 144-145
- Review, p. 146
- Formative Assessment, p. 147

Build Background, p. 140

Preview and Prepare, pp. 140-141

Selection Vocabulary, p. 141

Reading Recommendations, p. 141

Student Anthology, pp. 24-27

Comprehension Strategies

Making Connections, pp. 142-143

Predicting, p. 143

Supporting the Reading, pp. 144-145

Making Connections

Investigation

Investigating Concepts Beyond the Text, p. 27A

Word Analysis


Spelling: The /s/ Sound Pretest, p. 27F

Writing Process Strategies

Introduction to the Writing Process: Getting Ideas, p. 27F

English Language Conventions

Grammar: Nouns, p. 27F

DAY 4	DAY 5
<p>② Phonics and Fluency Developing Oral Language, p. 14N Dictation, p. 14N</p>	<p>General Review</p>
<p>Student Anthology, pp. 20–25  Comprehension Skills ▪ Classify and Categorize, pp. 21, 23, 25 Checking Comprehension, p. 25 Review Selection Vocabulary, p. 25B Literary Elements, p. 25D ▪ Point of View</p>	<p>✓ Selection Assessment ▪ "Gloria Who Might Be My Best Friend," pp. 2–5 Home Connection, p. 25B Science Connection ▪ Energy and the Wind, p. 25F</p>
<p>Supporting the Investigation ▪ Interviewing, p. 27D</p>	<p>Investigation ▪ Unit Investigation Continued ▪ Update Concept/Question Board</p>
<p>Word Analysis ▪ Spelling: The /a/ Sound, p. 27I ▪ Vocabulary: Vocabulary Strategies, p. 27I Writing Process Strategies ▪ Introduction to the Writing Process: Getting Ideas, p. 27I English Language Conventions ✓ ▪ Listening, Speaking, Viewing Listening: Being a Good Listener, p. 27I</p>	<p>Word Analysis ▪ Spelling: The /a/ Sound ✓ Final Test ▪ Vocabulary: ✓ Vocabulary Strategies, p. 27I Writing Process Strategies ▪ Introduction to the Writing Process: Getting Ideas, p. 27I English Language Conventions ✓ ▪ Penmanship: Cursive Letters i and t, p. 27I</p>



APPENDIX H
DISTRICT PACING GUIDE

APPENDIX J

SAMPLE LESSON PLAN FOR FIRST/SECOND
GRADE COMBINATION, ENGLISH LANGUAGE
LEARNERS CLASS

P.S.U.S.D. 2004-2005 OCR Pacing Guide Dates **Third**

Year- Round	Traditional
Unit/Story	
<i>Getting Started Lessons</i>	2 Days Aug 30-Aug 31
<i>Book I/ Unit 1</i>	38 Days Sept 1-Oct 25
Gloria	5
Angel Dragon	5
Stevie	5
Pricilla	6
Tree House	5
Dog Leopard	5
Teammates	5
Wrap-Up	2
<i>Book I/ Unit 2</i>	35 Days Oct 26-Dec 17
Critters	5

P.S.U.S.D. Pacing Guide, cont'd

City Lots	5
Springs	5
Urban Roosts	5
Ducklings	4
Superheroes	5
Sunflowers	4
Wrap-Up	2
<i>Book I/ Unit 3</i>	27 Days Nov3-Feb11
Blind Men	3
Grandpa's Eyes	5
Cat Poet	4
Picasso	5
B reman	4
Roxaboxen	4
Wrap-Up	2

P.S.U.S.D. Pacing Guide, cont'd

<i>Book 2/ Unit 4</i>	37 Days Feb 15-Apr 15
Story Story	5
Bro Grimm	6
Carving Pole	5
Oral Hist.	4
Flossie's Hats	5
Quilt	5
Home Place	5
Wrap-Up	2

APPENDIX I

DISTRICT EVALUATION OF COMPLIANCE



PALM SPRINGS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE 2004 - 2005

Power Standards School

Teacher

Open Court Reading: Evidence Identified by Reading the Walls

Daily Schedule	Date:	Comments	Date:	Comments	Date:
• A daily schedule is posted that indicates a minimum of 2,5 hours on OCR instruction each day.					
Sound/spelling Cards					
• Sound/Spelling Cards are displayed in plain view where all students can use them; OCR Sound/Spelling Cards are the only visible alphabet picture cards.					
• Cards are turned according to pacing.					
Concept/Question Board					
• Concept/Question Board is located in prominent place, accessible to students and big enough to use during instruction.					
• Concept/Question Board is labeled correctly, concept before question, theme included					
• There is evidence that Concept/Question Board was used to introduce the theme unit as well as before, during, and after each story. Questions make sense and relate to the theme.					
• There is evidence of student contributions.					
• Questions are moved to the Concept side when they are answered.					

• Posted work is graded and criteria for mastery are posted.				
ELD Implementation				
• Student work samples from Into English are posted along with ELD standards.				
• Pictures and graphic organizers are used to enrich vocabulary development.				
• There is evidence that realia, poems, and labels are used to support language development.				

Additional Feedback. _____

Open Court Reading: Evidence Observed During Instruction

Sound Spelling Cards				
• OCR methods are used to introduce Sound/Spelling Cards; cards are used during instruction.				
• Students are prompted to use Sound/Spelling Cards for spelling/decoding assistance.				
• Students demonstrate understanding of Sound/Spelling Cards, use them on their own and can tell a visitor how they use them.				
Concept Question Board				
• Concept/Question Board is used to introduce the theme and link each story to the unit theme				
• Concept/Question Board is reviewed daily, questions are answered and concepts are clarified and reviewed.				
Independent Work Time				
• Independent work time is scheduled daily. Groups meet with the teacher for intervention instruction.				
• Students not working with the teacher work independently or in groups on OCR lesson or language arts standards.				
Comprehension Strategies				
• OCR Comprehension Strategies (Question, Predict, Clarify, Sum-Up, Make Connections, Visualize, Reread, Interpret) are integrated during instruction. RT Skill Builders may be used (Clarify, Question, Predict, Summarize).				

Comprehension Strategies		Comment		Comment
• OCR Comprehension Strategies (Question, Predict, Clarify, Sum-Up, Make Connections, Visualize, Reread, Interpret). RT Skill Builder Terms may be posted (Clarify, Question, Predict, Summarize).				
• Students are prompted to use Sound/Spelling Cards for spelling/decoding assistance.				
OCR Workbooks				

Open Court Reading: Evidence Observed During Instruction

Sound Spelling Cards				
• OCR methods are used to introduce Sound/Spelling Cards; cards are used during instruction.				
• Students are prompted to use Sound/Spelling Cards for spelling/decoding assistance.				
• Students demonstrate understanding of Sound/Spelling Cards, use them on their own and can tell a visitor how they use them.				
Concept Question Board				
• Concept/Question Board is used to introduce the theme and link each story to the unit theme				
• Concept/Question Board is reviewed daily, questions are answered and concepts are clarified and reviewed.				
Independent Work Time				
• Independent work time is scheduled daily. Groups meet with the teacher for intervention instruction.				
• Students not working with the teacher work independently or in groups on OCR lesson or language arts standards.				

APPENDIX J
SAMPLE LESSON PLAN FOR FIRST/SECOND
GRADE COMBINATION, ENGLISH LANGUAGE
LEARNERS CLASS

Lesson Plans for Houghton-Mifflin Week of
January 5 - 9 for first and second grades.

DAY 1

First grade- Theme 4 Week 2

Second Grade- Theme 3
week 1

8:35-8:50 All do 10 Daily language experience: the man has
a mop

Daily Message from the First grade Manual T-76-
77.

8:50-9:10 Class splits.

First grade T-82-83 **Phonemic Awareness** with
Teacher: Clusters with S SL, SP, SN, SW, ST.

Second Grade with Ms.*** T-229 **Read Aloud.** Good
by Curtis. Listening Comprehension: Making
Judgments.

CA Standards: Listening and Speaking 1 and 3.

9:10-9:30 Class splits again.

First graders stay at seats and work with Ms.***

Do Practice book pages 161-62. Follow-up on s cluster words.

Second graders to carpet. Phonics Work..T-230a & 230b.

Diagraphs wh , sh, th, ch. and endings-er and est. Send to seats to work on Practice book pages 135 and 136.

9:30-10:00 First graders T-84-85. Phonics Work.

Silent Letters

kn, wr, gn, Practice Book pages 161 and 162 .

Review Strategy poster. Continue with Phonics Reader pages Knock, Knock.

Second Graders High Frequency Word Review

(winter, wind, lion, during) with Mrs. *** at carpet

and/or bean table. T-231. Make poster or use transparency 3-1. Kids do Practice book page 137.

RECESS 10:00 - 10:15

10:20- 10:40- All Students: Big Book from First grade manual.T78-79. The Secret Code- prior knowledge, picture walk, etc.

1040- 10:50 Spelling-pretests. 6 for first and 12 for second.

Correct together.

10:50- 11:15 First graders- do short spelling activity or write in journal.

Second graders -get spelling instruction: T236G and Practice book pages 144- 146. Take homework & alphabetize pg.241.

11:15- 11:30 Universal access group.

Pull first graders for more re-reading and spelling practice as needed.

Second graders continue independently.

11:30-11:40 Get ready for lunch. Wash hands.

11:45-12:28 Teacher/student lunch.

12:30- 1:30 Class Meeting/ Peace leaders. And Math.

First Graders-

Second Graders-

1:30-1:45 RECESS- Duty

1:45-2:35 English Language Development- ELD for English Speakers.

APPENDIX K
INTERNAL REVIEW BOARD LETTER

CSUSB
INSTITUTIONAL
REVIEW BOARD
Full
Board
Review IRB# 04045
Status APPROVED

Institutional Review Board
(IRB) California State
University, San Bernardino Ph:
(909) 880-5027

March 17, 2005

Francene M. Fisher
Professor Diane Brantley
Department of Language, Literacy & Culture
California State University San Bernardino
5500 University Parkway
San Bernardino, California 92407

Dear Ms. Fisher:

Your application to use human subjects, titled "Does California Mandated, Scripted Reading Curriculum Have an Effect on a Student's Motivation to Read?" has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB). All subsequent copies used must be this officially approved version. A change in your informed consent requires resubmission of your protocol as amended.

You are required to notify the IRB if any substantive changes are made in your research prospectus/protocol, if any unanticipated adverse events are experienced by subjects during your research, and when your project has ended. If your project lasts longer than one year, you (the investigator/researcher) are required to notify the IRB by email or correspondence of *Notice of Project Ending* or *Request for Continuation* at the end of each year. Failure to notify the IRB of the above may result in disciplinary action. You are required to keep copies of the informed consent forms and data for at least three years.

If you have any questions regarding the IRB decision, please contact Carmen Jones, (Interim) IRB Secretary. Mrs. Jones can be reached by phone at (909) 880-5027, by fax at (909) 880-7028, or by email at ccjones@csusb.edu. Please include your application identification number (above) in all correspondence.

Best of luck with your research.

Sincerely,

Joseph Lovett,

Chair

Institutional
Review Board

JL/ccj

cc: Prof. Diane Brantley - Department of Language, Literacy &
Culture

APPENDIX L
LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

Francene Fisher
45-835 Edgehill Drive
Palm Desert, CA 92260
February 24, 2005

XXXXXX
XXXXXX
XXXXXX
XXXXXX

Dear XXXXXX;

I am writing to ask your permission to administer a short, oral survey developed by Gambrell, Palmer, Coddling and Mazzone to 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders in your school as part of my M.A. thesis in Education at California State University San Bernardino.

I am attaching a copy of the survey. It takes 10 to 15 minutes to administer. I will provide parental Informed Consent forms in both English and Spanish. All students' responses and the name of your school site will remain anonymous.

I need to give the survey to a variety of schools in a variety of settings. Your school will be among many different schools that participate.

I will deeply appreciate your permission to administer this short survey at your school. With your permission, I will acknowledge your assistance (without revealing the findings at any one particular school) in the acknowledgement section of the thesis.

Yours in education,

Francene Fisher
M.A. Student, CSUSB
(760) 902-3836 (cell)

APPENDIX M
INFORMED CONSENT- ENGLISH

INFORMED CONSENT

The survey in which your child is being asked to participate in is designed to investigate students' motivation to read. Francene Fisher is conducting this study, under the supervision of Dr. Diane Brantley, Professor, College of Education- Language, Literacy & Culture. The Institutional Review Board, California State University, and San Bernardino have approved this study.

In this survey, your child will be asked to respond to 22 questions about how they feel about reading. For example, question number two states, "Reading a book is something I like to do: a) Never, b) Not very often, c) Sometimes, d) Often." The questionnaire will be read aloud to the students and should take about ten to fifteen minutes to complete. All of the responses will be held in the strictest of confidence by the researchers. Your child's name will not be reported with the responses. All data will be reported in group form only. You may receive the group results of this study upon completion at Cal. State University, San Bernardino, by contacting Dr. Brantley at the number below.

Your child's participation in this study is totally voluntary. They are free not to answer any questions and withdraw at any time during this study without penalty. When they have completed the questionnaire, they may be asked to participate in a one on one interview with the researcher. She will be asking more detailed question, face to face. This should take no more than five to ten minutes. An example of an interview question is, "Tell me about the most interesting story or book you have read in the last week or two."

If you **DO NOT** want your child to participate, please check the box below. If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please feel free to contact Diane Brantley, PhD. at (909) 880-5605.

I do NOT want my child to participate ☐

Today's date: _____

Childs' name: _____

Parent or Guardian Signature: _____

APPENDIX N
INFORMED CONSENT- SPANISH

INFORMACIO DE CONCENTIMIENTO

La encuesta en la qual se le ha pedido a su Hijo(a) su participacion ha sido diseñada para investigar la motivacion de los alumnos hacia la lectura. La Profesora Francene Fisher esta conduciendo este estudio bajo la supervisión de Dr. Diane Brantley, el Profesor, el Colegio de la Educación- del Lenguaje, Litiratura y Cultura.

La Mesa Institucional de exámenes de la Universidad del estado de California, y San Bernardino han aprobado este estudio.

En esta examinacion, a su Hijo(a) se le preguntara y contestara 22 preguntas a cerca de cómo se siente sobre la lectura. Por ejemplo, pregunta el número dos dice:, "Leer un libro es algo que me gusta hacer: A) nunca, B) no todo el tiempo, C) Algunas Veces, D) Frequentamente."

El cuestionario será leído en voz alta a los estudiantes y solo tomar aproximadamente 10 o 15 minutos. Todas las repuestas seran confidencialmente guardadas por los examinadores.

El nombre de su hijo(a) no apercera en el reporte de repuestas. Todo la informacion recabada sera reportada en grupos solamente.

Usted podria recibir los resultados del estudio del grupo despues de terminada, llamado a la Dra. Brantley si número de telefono indicado abajo en la Universidad del Estado de California en San Bernardino.

La participación de su hijo(a) en este estudio es totalmente voluntario. Ellos tienen la opcion de no contestar las preguntas y salirse de este estudio en cualquier momento sin ninguna consecuencia. Cuando ellos hallan terminado con la examinacion, tal vez se les pregunte si quieren participar en una entrevista. Este entrevista tomara no mas de 5 a 10 minutos. Un ejemplo de la entrevista podria ser: "Dime a cerca del libro o cuento hallas leído la semana pasada o antepasada."

Si usted no quiere que su Hijo(a) participe, por favor, marque el cuadro de abajo.
Si tiene cualquier pregunta o preocupacion a cerca del studio, por favor, hable con la
Diane Brantley, Ph.D. en (909) 880-5605.

☐ Yo no quiero que mi niño participe la fecha de es: _____

Nombre del nino: _____

Firma del padre Guardián: _____

APPENDIX O
SUMMARY OF CONVERSATION WITH ASSISTANT
SUPERINTENDENT

In March, 2005, the researcher contacted a principal from one of the three local school districts regarding her survey. The principal was open to the idea. However, she indicated that since she was new, she would feel more comfortable if the Assistant Superintendent of Instruction granted permission.

The researcher sent a packet to the Assistant, which contained a cover letter, a copy of the survey, including documentation of the validity and how it was developed. Also included, were copies of parental consent forms in both English and Spanish. After several phone calls, researcher was able to set up a phone appointment to further discuss the thesis and the survey. The following is a paraphrased transcript of the conversation between the researcher and the Assistant Superintendent.

The conversation took place on Tuesday, February 8th at 10:00 A.M. Although the packet had been sent to the Assistant Superintendent in mid- January, she had not yet received the information. After informing her of the purpose of the thesis, the validity of the survey, assurances of anonymity, opportunity for parents to opt out, and the pending Internal Review Board Approval, the Superintendent denied access to the researcher.

She stated her decision was based on the following reasons:

- California's curriculum was not mandated. It was possible to use materials, which were not officially adopted.
- Although Open Court the SLP used by the district, was scripted, it was highly effective and she believed the proof would be in the test score results.
- Many teachers complained about the program. However, she said, "These teachers are lazy, and merely want to push worksheets. They do not want to teach".

The researcher, reiterated that the thesis was not questioning at the effectiveness of California's adopted curriculum, but was questioning if the curriculum had an effect of students' motivation to read. Further, the researcher informed the Superintendent that she had no hypothesis.

The researcher further explained the genesis of the idea for the project. She is the mother of two girls. One is an excellent student with a high grade point average, for whom learning comes easily. This daughter does not like reading. The second child, a fourth grader, struggles. She works hard and is a high C student, at best. Despite this, she loves to read, especially, informational text. The original thesis was going to examine what motivates students to read. As she became more familiar with the

adopted curriculum, the project evolved to include the curriculum and teaching methods.

The Superintendent again refused, stating that the researcher taught in private school and had no experience with the "reality" of the student population. This is not true, and the researcher gave her teaching history: three years in the public school system, CLAD certified, SDIAE training, and Spanish speaking. Nevertheless, the Superintendent denied access to her schools.

She further inquired as to the names of the researcher's thesis committee. Additionally, she informed the researcher that she was surprised that this type of project would be approved by California State University. (To date, the Assistant Superintendent has contacted neither committee member.)

Prior to the end of the conversation, the researcher asked the Superintendent if she was part of the team, which selected Open Court over Houghton Mifflin for the district. It turns out that the Assistant Superintendent was head of the decision making committee, and she personally had spend a sizeable amount of time and money visiting other sites, attending conferences, reviewing the scientific research and traveling to Sacramento.

Note: It is the opinion of the researcher that this conversation is but one illustration of the controversial nature of the Reading First portion of No Child Left Behind.

As more and more states fail to meet AYP goals, the debate over the legality and effectiveness of the legislation is growing. By February 2005 legislators in thirty-one states had introduced bills, which challenged various aspects of the law (Olson, 2005). Many states including Connecticut, Maine and Utah have filed lawsuits against the U.S. Department of Education based on various grounds.

In addition, the National Education Association, the Nation's largest teacher's union filed a suit on behalf of several school districts. The union's lawsuit challenges the legality of the NCLB because it forces states to comply or lose funding. It also contends that there is inadequate funding. Reg Weaver, the President of the Union said, "The idea behind the challenge is simple. If you regulate, you must pay" (Sack, 2005). The Federal answer to the lawsuit is that states could give up funding if they do not wish to comply. (Sack).

APPENDIX P
READING SURVEY

Reading Survey

Number _____

Date _____

I am in _____ grade

I am a _____ Boy _____ Girl

1. My friends think I am _____

- ☐ A very good reader
- ☐ A good reader
- ☐ An OK reader
- ☐ A poor reader

2. Reading a book is something I like to do

- ☐ Never
- ☐ Not very often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Often

3. I read

- ☐ Not as well as my friends
- ☐ About the same as my friends
- ☐ A little better than my friends
- ☐ A lot better than my friends

4. My best friends think reading is _____

- ☐ Really fun
- ☐ Fun
- ☐ Ok to do
- ☐ No fun at all

- ☐ No fun at all

5. When I come to a word I don't know, I can _____

- ☐ Almost always figure it out
- ☐ Sometimes figure it out
- ☐ Almost never figure it out
- ☐ Never figure it out

6. I tell my friends about good books I read.

- ☐ I never do this
- ☐ I almost never do this
- ☐ I do this some of the time
- ☐ I do this a lot

7. When I am reading by myself, I understand _____

- ☐ Almost everything I read
- ☐ Some of what I read
- ☐ Almost none of what I read
- ☐ None of what I read

8. People who read a lot are _____

- ☐ Very interesting
- ☐ Interesting
- ☐ Not very interesting
- ☐ Boring

9. I am _____

- ☐ A poor reader
- ☐ An OK reader
- ☐ A good reader
- ☐ A very good reader

10. I think libraries are _____

- ☐ A great place to spend time
- ☐ An interesting place to spend time
- ☐ An OK place to spend time
- ☐ A boring time to spend time

11. I worry about what other kids think about my reading _____

- ☐ Every day
- ☐ Almost every day
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Never

12. Knowing how to read well is _____

- ☐ Not very important
- ☐ Sort of important
- ☐ Important

- ☐ Very important

13. When my teacher asks me a question about what I have read, I _____

- ☐ Can never think of an answer
- ☐ Have trouble thinking of an answer
- ☐ Sometimes think of an answer
- ☐ Always think of an answer

14. I think reading is _____

- ☐ A boring way to spend time
- ☐ An OK way to spend time
- ☐ An interesting way to spend time
- ☐ A great way to spend time

15. Reading is _____

- ☐ Very easy for me
- ☐ Kind of easy for me
- ☐ Kind of hard for me
- ☐ Very hard for me

16. When I grow up I will spend _____

- ☐ None of my time reading
- ☐ Very little of my time reading
- ☐ Some of my time reading

- ☐ A lot of my time reading

17. When I am in a group talking about stories, I _____

- ☐ Almost never talk about my ideas
- ☐ Sometimes talk about my ideas
- ☐ Almost always talk about my ideas
- ☐ Always talk about my ideas

18. I would like for my teacher to read books out loud to the class _____

- ☐ Every day
- ☐ Almost every day
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Never

19. When I read out loud I am a _____

- ☐ Poor reader
- ☐ OK reader
- ☐ Good Reader
- ☐ Very good reader

20. When someone gives me a book for a present, I feel _____

- ☐ Very happy
- ☐ Sort of happy
- ☐ Sort of unhappy
- ☐ Unhappy

21. I like to read

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

22. At home, if I had nothing to do I _____

- ☐ Would read
- ☐ Would watch TV.

APPENDIX Q

TABLE 1

Profile of Schools Surveyed

School	Type	API	AYP Met?	Scripted Curriculum?
A	Private	NA	NA	No
B	Private	NA	NA	Supplemental
C	Public	858	Yes	Supplemental
D	Public	772	Yes	Yes
E	Public	675	No	Yes
F	Public	575	No	Yes
G	Public	620	No	Yes
H	Public	781	Yes	No
I	Public	652	Yes**	Yes
J	Public	NA (OHIO)	No	No
K	Public	NA (NEW MEXICO)	No	No

Notes: ** School I has is a new school, which opened in the 2003/2004 school year.

APPENDIX R

TABLE 2

Comparison of Responses Between
Non-Scripted and Scripted Groups

Question	Non- Scripted	Scripted	+/- .4
1	3.09	3.11	
2	2.30	3.28	+.98
3	2.63	2.53	
4	2.40	2.58	
5	3.33	3.33	
6	2.53	2.76	
7	3.73	3.68	
8	2.68	3.16	+.48
9	3.03	3.05	
10	3.03	3.05	
11	1.65	2.06	+.41
12	3.68	3.70	
13	3.15	3.26	
14	2.84	3.38	+.54
15	3.51	3.38	
16	3.13	3.18	
17	2.41	2.62	
18	3.33	3.06	
19	2.71	2.84	

20	3.31	3.48	
21	88% like to read	84% like to read	
22	44% read, 54% TV, 2% NA	44% read, 51% TV, 5%	

REFERENCES

- Allen, S. (2003). An analytic comparison of three models of reading strategy instruction. *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 41(4), 319 - 339.
- Allington, R. L. (1997). Overselling phonics. *Reading Today*, 15(1), 15-17.
- Allington, Richard L. (2002). *Big brother and the national reading curriculum: How ideology trumped evidence*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- American Federation of Teachers (1998). *Building on the best, learning from what works: seven promising Reading and English Language Arts programs*. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers.
- Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80, 260-267.
- Ames, Carole (1992). Classrooms: goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(3), 261-271.
- Anderson, R., Heibert, E., Scott, J., & Wilkinson, I. (1985). *Becoming a nation of readers* (). Washington: D.C.: National Academy of Science.

- Anderson, R., Heibert, E., Scott, J., & Wilkinson, I.
(1985). *Becoming a nation of readers* (). Washington,
DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*.
New York: W.H. freeman.
- Barbour, Nita (1998). "Can we prepackage thinking?"
Childhood Education, 65(2), 67-68.
- Beck, I. L., & McKeown, M. G. (2001). Text talk: Capturing
the benefits of read-aloud experiences for young
children. *Reading Teacher*, 55(1), 10-21.
- Boyd, Vickie V. (2002). A case study of the perceived
impact of commercially prepared and increasingly
scripted learning programs in elementary school (K-6th
grades) (Doctoral dissertation, University of La
Verne, 2002).
- Burley, J. (1980). Short term, high intensity reading
practice methods for upward bound students: An
appraisal. *Negro Educational Review*, 31, 156-61.
- California Department of Education (2002). *California's
reading first plan as approved by the United States
Department of Education, August 23, 2002* ().
Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- California Department of Education. (2004,). *No Child Left
Behind*. Retrieved October 30, 2004, from
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/rla2002.pub.asp>

California Department of Education. (2005). *Price lists of adopted instructional materials*. Retrieved March 31, 2005, from <http://www.hobel.org/lwved/id35.htm>

California Department of Education. (n.d.). *English learners by language*. Retrieved November 13, 04, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/lc/ellang01s.asp>

Calkins, L. (2001). *The art of teaching reading*. New York: Longman.

Cambourne, B. (1988). *The whole story: Natural learning and the acquisition of literacy in the classroom*. Auckland: Scholastic.

Campbell, B., Johnson, N., & Noe, K. (1995). *Literature circles and response*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Carter, C. (1997). Why reciprocal teaching? *Educational Leadership*, (March 1997), 64-68.

Carter, Carolyn (2004). The case for informational text. *Educational Leadership*, 54(6), 64-71.

CDE. (2004). *Waiver office, Department of Education*. Retrieved March 31, 2005, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/lr/wr/documents/revpetitionform.doc>

Cero, J. L., Cauley, K. M., & Chafin, C. (2003). Students' perspectives on their high school experiences. *Adolescence*, 38(152).

Davis, Z. (1988). A comparison of the effectiveness of sustained silent reading and directed reading activity on students' reading achievement. *High School Journal*, 72, 46-48.

Department of Education. (2005). *Preliminary overview of programs and changes included in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Retrieved February 1, 2005, from United State Department of Education Web Site: http://www.ed.gov/nclb/overview/intro/guide/guide_pg19.html#read

Duke, Nell (2004). The case for informational text. *Educational Leadership*, 61(6), 40 - 44.

Eccles, J., Adler, T., Futterman, R., & Goff, S., et al. (1983). *Achievement and achievement motivation*. San Francisco: Freeman.

Ed. Data. (2004, May 12). *California Department of Education* Retrieved November 1, 2004, from <http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/welcome.asp>

Ed.Gov. (n.d.). *Research based instruction in reading*. Retrieved March 8, 2005, from United States Department of Education Web Site: <http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/read/rb/edlite-025.html>

- Ed-Data. (2005). *Fiscal, demographic, and performance data on California K-12 schools*. Retrieved March 8, 2005, from California Department of Education Web Site: <http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us>
- Elley, W. (1991). Acquiring literacy in a second language: The effect of book based programs. *Language Learning*, 41, 375-411.
- Evans, & Towner (1948). The effect of comic books on vocabulary growth and comprehension. *Elementary English*, 25, 109-13.
- Foorman, Barbara R., Francis, David J., Fletcher, Jack M., Schatschneider, Christopher, & Meta, P (1998). The role of instruction in learning to read: preventing reading failure in at-risk children. *Journal of Education Psychology*, 90, 37-55.
- Gambrell, L., Palmer, B., Codling, R., & Mazzone, S. (1996). Assessing motivation to read. *The Reading Teacher*, 49(7), 518-533.
- Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (3rd ed., pp. 403-422). New York: Longman.
- Houghton Mifflin (Ed.). (2003). *Houghton Mifflin Reading, California*. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company.

- Hunter, P. C. (2002, February 22). *Accountability*. Paper presented at the meeting of The Secretary's Reading Leadership Academy. Washington, DC.
- Hurley, S. R., & Tinajero, J. V. (2001). *Literacy assessment of second language learners*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Johns, J. L., & Lenski, S. D. (2001). *Improving reading-strategies and resources* (3rd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing Company.
- Johnston, P. H. (1997). *Knowing literacy: constructive literacy assessment*. Portland, Maine: Stenhouse.
- Kameenui, E. J. (2002, February 20). *Effective Instruction*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Secretary's Reading Leadership Academy. Washington, DC.
- Keene, E. O., & Zimmerman, S. (1997). *The mosaic of thought*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Krashen, S. (1993). *The power of reading: insights from the research*. Englewood: Libraries, Unlimited.
- Krashen, S. (2001). More smoke and mirrors: A critique on the National Reading Panel Report on fluency. *Phi Delta Kappan*, October, 121.
- Langford, J., & Allen, E. (1983). The effects of U.S.S.R. on students' attitudes and achievements. *Reading Horizons*, 23, 194-200.